

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF PLAINFIELD PLANNING BOARD  
GRANTING PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL,  
BULK VARIANCES; SUPPLEMENTAL ZONE VARIANCES AND A DESIGN WAIVER  
TO VIETREAL UNITED GROUP, LLC  
BLOCK 239, LOTS 5.01 AND 7  
PB 2022-01**

WHEREAS, **VIETREAL UNITED GROUP, LLC** (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant") has applied to the Planning Board of the City of Plainfield for preliminary and final site plan approval, bulk variances, supplemental zone variances and a design waiver, for property located at 437-457 West Front Street, also known as Block 239, Lots 5.01 and 7 on the Tax Map of the City of Plainfield (hereinafter the "Subject Property"); which application has been listed as PB 2022-01; and

WHEREAS, the site plan is shown on a plan entitled "Major Site Plan, Lots 5.01 & 7, Block 239, City of Plainfield, Union County, New Jersey, Tax Map Sheet No. 160" prepared by Sharif H. Aly, P.E., of Amertech Engineering, Inc., dated December 19, 2021, last revised March 2, 2023, consisting of six (6) sheets; and architectural plans entitled "Mixed-Use Building, 437 West Front Street, Plainfield, NJ," prepared by David W. Buckman, AIA, NCARB, dated July 11, 2022, last revised March 2, 2023, consisting of two (2) 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 public hearings on February 16, 2023 and March 16, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the Board received and reviewed reports from the Board Professional Planner and the Board Professional 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 of the Subject Property which is located in the Mixed Use District ("MU") zone.

2. The Subject Property consists of 25,035 square feet ("SF") and is located opposite the t-intersection of Washington Avenue and West Front Street. It is currently vacant with the exception of two (2) billboards.

3. At the time of the initial hearing on February 16, 2023, the Applicant proposed to construct a three-story mixed-use structure. Specifically, the mixed-use structure was to contain: 4,800 SF of retail space (laundromat); 10 residential apartment units; and 36 parking spaces, as well as an entrance lobby for the residential apartments (hereinafter the "Applicant's Project").

4. In connection with the project, at the time of the February 16, 2023 hearing, Applicant sought bulk variances related to: minimum front yard setback - where required is 10 feet and proposed is 5 feet; and maximum lot coverage - where required is 70% and proposed is 76.5%.

5. Additionally, at the time of the February 16, 2023 hearing, the Applicant also required supplementary zone variances and design waivers from the City's Land Use Ordinance (hereinafter "LUO") for the following conditions:

a. Section 17:9-24.C requires a parking lot to be buffered a minimum of five (5) feet from non-residential uses or districts; and a portion of the easterly parking area has no setback from the property boundary with a commercial lot;

b. Section 17:9-42.E requires that a parking lot be located to the rear of a building or the interior of a

site; and a portion of the parking area is located to the side of the proposed building;

c. Section 17:9-42.J requires that 46 parking spaces be provided; and 36 parking spaces are proposed;

d. Section 17:9-43.B requires that at least 5% of the interior of a parking lot containing more than ten (10) spaces be provided with landscaped planting islands; and no landscaped planting islands are proposed; and

e. Section 17:11-8.B.9b requires private open space above the first floor; and no private open space is proposed.

6. At the initial hearing on February 16, 2023, Joseph Castor, Esq., the Applicant's attorney provided a summary of the Applicant's proposal. He confirmed that the Applicant was seeking preliminary and final site plan approval as well as variance relief in order to construct the Applicant's Project on the Subject Property.

7. Mr. Castor advised that the Subject Property is located in the MU Zone and is currently vacant. He confirmed that the Applicant would consolidate the Subject Property by deed if the application were approved by the Board. Mr. Castor further indicated that the Subject Property is currently

improved with two billboard which would be removed if the application were approved by the Board.

8. At the initial hearing on February 16, 2023, Sharif H. Ali, P.E., the Applicant's Site Engineer provided testimony concerning the conditions at the Subject Property, as well as the Applicant's proposed improvements. He advised that the Subject Property contains approximately 25,000 SF and is located in the MU Zone.

9. Mr. Ali proffered Exhibit A-1, consisting of a site rendering and layout; which was entered into the record by the Board. He confirmed that the two lots would be consolidated as a voluntary condition of any approval from the Board.

10. Mr. Ali advised that the Subject Property is located opposite the t-intersection of West Front Street and Washington Avenue. He indicated that the former structures on the Subject Property had been previously demolished.

11. Mr. Ali testified that the Applicant Project meets most of the bulk requirements within the MU Zone. He noted that the Applicant's Project did require bulk variances for front yard setback and lot coverage.

12. Mr. Ali indicated that the Applicant proposed to construct a mixed-use building on the Subject Property. He noted that the first floor would contain approximately 4,800 SF

of retail use (laundromat), as well as an entrance lobby for the residential apartments on the second and third floors. He stated that the second and third floors would contain a total of ten residential apartments; consisting of six one-bedroom apartments and four two-bedroom apartments.

13. Mr. Ali indicated that 46 parking spaces were required under the LUO in connection with the Applicant's Project. He noted that the credit provided for the required electric vehicle charging stations reduced the number of spaces to 42. Mr. Ali advised that the Applicant was proposing 36 parking spaces. He confirmed that the Applicant was requesting a variance for this condition.

14. Mr. Ali indicated that stormwater management would be accomplished through two recharge areas, as well as an underground detention basin.

15. Mr. Ali indicated that site landscaping would consist of street trees, low, medium, and high shrubs, as well as foundation plantings. He noted that a six-foot-high fence would surround the Subject Property.

16. Mr. Ali thereafter reviewed the variance relief required by the Applicant's Project. He noted that the Applicant required a front yard setback variance; a lot coverage variance; a parking variance; a minimum buffer for parking lot

variance; a parking lot landscaping variance; and a parking lot location variance.

17. Mr. Ali confirmed that the Applicant's proposed site lighting would meet the requirements of the LUO.

18. Mr. Ali indicated that with respect to the proposed parking, the City of Plainfield is an urban community. He noted that the standard for parking is set by the Residential Site Improvement Standards ("RSIS") which does not differentiate based upon the property location. Mr. Ali noted that the neighborhood in which the Subject Property is located has both walkable retail and residential uses.

19. Referring to Exhibit A-1, Mr. Ali indicated that one full movement driveway was proposed for the Subject Property on West Front Street. He confirmed that the proposed driveway met the requirements of the LUO. Mr. Ali stated that the exit would be stop controlled.

20. Mr. Ali proffered Exhibit A-2, consisting of a turning template for garbage trucks; which was entered into the record by the Board. Referring to Exhibit A-2, he confirmed that a garbage truck could safely access the Subject Property.

21. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Ali indicated that the Applicant would voluntarily agree to limit movements from the Subject Property onto West Front Street to

right turn only. This condition would prohibit left turns from the Subject Property onto West Front Street.

22. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner, Mr. Ali indicated that two of the EV spaces would be installed immediately; while the remaining two would be make ready EV spaces.

23. The Board expressed concern over the lack of a written Refuse and Recycling Plan. Mr. Ali acknowledged that a written Refuse and Recycling Plan setting forth the number of trash days; the time of pickup; and the manner in which trash is moved from the building to the refuse and recycling area needed to be set forth in a written document for the Board.

24. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Castor indicated that the size of the building and its location was the result of meetings with the City. He indicated that Applicant was attempting to construct as many parking spaces as possible on the Subject Property. Mr. Castor acknowledged that if the number of residential units was decreased, the number of required parking spaces would be reduced and that less impervious coverage could be required. He confirmed that the Applicant would review the proposed number of apartment units to determine the viability of eliminating one or more units.



25. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner, Mr. Ali confirmed that the Applicant could voluntarily comply with the Report of the Board Planner dated February 3, 2023.

26. At the initial hearing on February 16, 2023, David W. Buckman, A.I.A., N.C.A.R.B., the Applicant's Architect provided testimony concerning the proposed improvements on the Subject Property. He indicated that the Applicant initially hired him to explore a two-story mixed-use structure with a laundromat and residential apartments. Mr. Buckman advised that as a result of meetings with the City, a third floor was added to provide additional apartments at the site.

27. Mr. Buckman confirmed that a five-foot front yard setback was proposed for the structure.

28. Referring to the architectural plan set, Mr. Buckman thereafter reviewed floor plans for each story of the proposed structure. He noted that the first floor would contain the store front, the laundromat, a residential lobby, fire stairs and an elevator. He noted that 50 washing machines and 58 clothes dryers were proposed in the laundromat, as well as lavatories, vending machines, storage and office space. Mr. Buckman indicated that a secure residential entry lobby was proposed for the apartment units on the first floor.

29. Mr. Buckman indicated that the second and third floors would each contain five residential apartment units. He noted that three one-bedroom units and two two-bedroom units were proposed for each floor. Mr. Buckman confirmed that each of residential apartment would be improved with a clothes washer and dryer.

30. Mr. Buckman indicated that the basement level of the structure would be used for utilities and storage. He confirmed that each residential apartment would be provided with private storage space of approximately 900 cubic feet; more than satisfying the requirements of the LUO. Mr. Buckman stated that the basement would have no cross-access between the commercial storage space and the residential storage space.

31. Mr. Buckman indicated that the roof would be mostly empty with some rooftop equipment for the laundromat and venting for the residential bathrooms and washers/dryers.

32. Mr. Buckman indicated that mailboxes would be located within the residential lobby area; and that the Applicant would explore the ability to provide a package delivery area somewhere within the structure.

33. Mr. Buckman indicated that no on-site property manager was proposed. He noted that the Applicant would own the mixed-use building and manage the site.

34. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner, Mr. Buckman indicated that no private open space was proposed for the residential apartment units. He noted that some communal open space was located towards the rear of the Subject Property and would be improved with benches and picnic tables.

35. Mr. Buckman indicated that proposed signage for the building would be applied for at a later date and would comply with the requirements of the LUO.

36. Mr. Buckman thereafter reviewed the proposed building façade. He proffered Exhibit A-3, consisting of a rendering of the proposed building viewed from West Front Street; which was entered into the record by the Board. Mr. Buckman indicated that the building height was modulated in order to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

37. Mr. Buckman confirmed that the materials proposed for the structure would be the same on all sides.

38. Mr. Buckman advised that no satellite dishes would be permitted for the residential tenants. He stated that the Applicant would include a provision within the apartment leases prohibiting satellite dishes. Mr. Buckman confirmed that the Applicant would design the building to provide cable television and internet connections.

39. At the initial hearing on February 16, 2023, Frank Miskovich, the Applicant's Traffic Engineer provided testimony concerning the Applicant's Project and the parking and traffic impacts of same.

40. Mr. Miskovich confirmed that the Applicant required a parking variance. He noted that 36 spaces were proposed; while 46 spaces were required and the LUO and RSIS. Mr. Miskovich confirmed that the RSIS included 5 visitor spaces within the 19 parking spaces required for the residential apartments.

41. Mr. Miskovich thereafter reviewed the anticipated supply and demand of parking for the Applicant's Project. He noted that based upon Institute of Traffic Engineers data, the peak parking demand for the site would be 12 vehicles for the residential use and 27 vehicles for the laundromat use; resulting in a total peak demand of 39 spaces.

42. Mr. Miskovich indicated that based upon the U.S. Census data for the City of Plainfield, approximately 5 to 9 vehicles were anticipated for the residential apartment units. He opined that 31 spaces would be required for the Applicant's Project in his expert opinion.

43. Mr. Miskovich noted that the calculation of the parking demand was static and did not include the fluctuations of parking need over various days and times. He indicated that

the effect of shared parking would mitigate the resultant impact of the Applicant's parking variance.

44. Mr. Miskovich opined that the Subject Property would have an anticipated weekday surplus of between 7 and 18 spaces during the day; and a weekend surplus of between 2 and 4 spaces.

45. Mr. Miskovich thereafter indicated that he had reviewed the West Front Street traffic and advised that approximately 4 to 5 vehicles were anticipated to enter or leave the Subject Property on an hourly basis. He confirmed that a traffic count was not performed at the Subject Property.

46. Upon inquiry from the Board concerning the prohibition of left turns from the Subject Property, Mr. Miskovich indicated that he shares the concern and indicated that such a prohibition would be appropriate.

47. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Miskovich indicated that the train station is approximately one-half mile from the Subject Property.

48. In response to an inquiry from the Board concerning the designation of commercial and residential parking at the site, Mr. Miskovich indicated that the parking would be self-regulating and designation of parking spaces for each use would not be required or recommended.

49. At the initial hearing on February 16, 2023, Elizabeth McManus, P.P., A.I.C.P., the Applicant's Professional Planner provided testimony concerning the variance relief required by the Applicant, as well as the planning justification for the requested relief.

50. Ms. McManus confirmed that the Applicant required variances for front yard setback, lot coverage, number of parking spaces, parking buffering, landscape islands and parking lot location.

51. Ms. McManus confirmed that the variance relief could be justified under a (c)(2) basis. She indicated that the Applicant's proposal was a better zoning alternative; and would advance purposes (a) and (i) of the Municipal Land Use Law.

52. Ms. McManus indicated that she had reviewed the surrounding lots and the Applicant's proposed front yard setback of 5 feet was consistent with the setbacks on surrounding properties. She noted that the provision of a consistent front yard setback was important for the creation of a quality streetscape along West Front Street. Ms. McManus further stated that a provision of a 5-foot front yard setback permitted the Applicant to maximize the number of parking spaces provided at the rear of the property. She also testified that the uses to the rear of the property were single-family dwellings and that a

compliant front yard setback would move the proposed mixed-use structure towards the single-family uses.

53. Ms. McManus thereafter reviewed the negative criteria for the front yard setback. She noted that the public good is measured by the impact of the variances on the surrounding lots. She opined that there was not any substantial detriment on the surrounding properties from the Applicant's proposed front yard setback; and indicated that a quality streetscape would be provided by the Applicant's Project.

54. The Board thereafter noted that it had no issue with the proposed lot coverage and landscaping variances and requested that Ms. McManus focus on the parking variance being requested by the Applicant.

55. Ms. McManus noted that the provision of additional apartments would supply more consumers within the neighborhood in which the Subject Property is located. She noted that adequate parking was being provided on the Subject Property; as the maximum number of spaces needed was 34 according to the Applicant's Traffic Engineer. Ms. McManus noted that the additional residents would contribute to the economic viability of the City of Plainfield.

56. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Ms. McManus acknowledged that reducing the number of apartments would reduce

the parking demand. She noted the importance of compliance with the LUO; but opined that it was equally important that the project to be well suited to the area and provide maximum benefits to the public.

57. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Castor indicated that the Applicant would voluntarily agree to reduce the number of apartments by one and to provide an amenity space within the residential apartment area.

58. During the public comment period at the February 16, 2023 meeting a member of the public questioned anticipated odors from the laundry use; the lack of an on-site manager; and the need for a prohibition on left turns from the Subject Property onto West Front Street. In response, Mr. Castor indicated that ventilation from the laundry would be separated from the residences; that the Applicant was local and would be at the Subject Property frequently to provide management services; and that trip generation from the site was minimal.

59. At the initial hearing on February 16, 2023, Bao Vu, the Applicant's representative provided testimony concerning the anticipated operation of the laundromat at the Subject Property. He indicated that the hours of operation would be between 7:00 am and 10:00 pm each day; with the last wash commencing at 8:30 pm.



60. Mr. Vu stated that two total employees would be at the site each day; consisting of two shifts with one employee per shift. He advised that only one employee other than Mr. Vu would be employed at the site.

61. Mr. Vu indicated that residential tenants would be required to bring their garbage from the apartment units to the trash and recycling area. He confirmed that the Applicant would work with its waste removal company to arrive at the site prior to the commencement of the laundromat business day.

62. Mr. Vu confirmed that cable television and internet connections would be provided for each of the residential apartments.

63. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Vu indicated that uniform window treatments would be provided for all of the residential apartment units.

64. Mr. Vu confirmed that no separate fee would be charged for the provision of parking spaces for the residential tenants (in compliance with the requirements of the LUO).

65. At the conclusion of the hearing on February 16, 2023, the Applicant requested that the hearing be adjourned so that revised plans and supplemental information could be supplied to address concerns raised by the Board and the Board Professionals.

66. At the hearing on March 16, 2023, Mr. Castor appeared and provided a summary of the status of the application. He confirmed that the Applicant had received the comments of the Board and its Professionals at the prior meeting; and that the Applicant had submitted revised plans and supplemental materials (including a written Refuse and Recycling Plan) to address same. Mr. Castor indicated that the Applicant would be relying on the testimony of its Traffic Engineer and Professional Planner from the hearing on February 16, 2023.

67. At the hearing on March 16, 2023, Mr. Ali appeared and provided testimony concerning the plan revisions made in response to the comments of the Board and its Professionals at the February 16, 2023 meeting. Mr. Ali indicated that a one-bedroom apartment had been eliminated; and amenity space had been added in its place.

68. Mr Ali noted that two parking spaces had been removed in order to create an area which could be used for deliveries, as well for tenant move-in/move-out. In response to an inquiry from the Board, he indicated that bollards would be added to the sides of the area in order to provide additional protection during times of deliveries and tenant move-in/move-out. Mr. Ali advised that as a result of the elimination of the one-bedroom apartment unit and the two parking spaces, the Applicant was

seeking a parking variance for the provision of 34 parking spaces where 36 parking spaces was otherwise required under the LUO.

69. The Applicant's Project as modified by the modification of the one-bedroom apartment and the conversion of two parking spaces to a delivery and move-in/move-out area shall hereinafter be known as the "Applicant's Amended Project."

70. Mr. Ali indicated that 9 of the 10 spaces located adjacent to rear of the structure would be assigned to the residential apartment units (at a rate of 1 parking space for each apartment). In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Ali confirmed that an additional 9 spaces could be assigned in the rear of the parking area for the residential apartments at a rate of 1 space per unit.

71. Mr. Ali indicated that a detail had been added to the site plan prohibiting left turns from the Subject Property onto West Front Street.

72. Mr. Ali advised that the Applicant had addressed the concerns of the City Police Department and the City Fire Department. He confirmed that the Applicant would address any additional requirements from the Police Department and Fire Department as a condition of approval.

73. At the hearing on March 16, 2023, Beata Szacillo, R.A., the Applicant Architect, provided testimony concerning the architectural plan revisions made in response to the comments of the Board and its Professionals at the February 16, 2023 meeting. Referring to Sheet SK-1 from the architectural plan set, she confirmed that one one-bedroom apartment had been eliminated from the second floor of the residential apartments to create a common amenity space.

74. Ms. Szacillo advised that mailboxes would be provided in the main lobby of the residential apartments. She testified that secured keyed access would be supplied to the mailbox area.

75. Ms. Szacillo confirmed that the basement area had been reconfigured by the Applicant. She noted that nine storage spaces were provided for the residential apartments; each consisting of 568 cubic feet. Ms. Szacillo advised that the basement storage spaces for the apartment units would be secure and require a keyed access. She testified that the basement space had been more appropriately delineated; separating residential and commercial spaces.

76. Ms. Szacillo indicated that the HVAC units would be packaged Terminal Air Conditioning ("PTAC") units. She noted that the grills of the PTAC units on the façade would match the

color of the area of the façade in which the grills were located.

77. Ms. Szacillo advised that the second access door for the residential lobby could be located further from the initial door in order to create a package delivery area. She indicated that the access to the package delivery area would be provided by a laundromat employee who would open the initial door as necessary.

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 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 LUO.

2. The Board also concludes that the minimum front yard setback, maximum lot coverage, parking setback, parking location, minimum number of parking spaces and parking lot landscaping variances can all be granted under a flexible (c)(2) analysis. The benefit to the City is the development of the

Subject Property with a use permitted by the LOU; and the advancement of the purposes of the MLUL, as identified by the Applicant's Professional Planner. 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. Based upon the forgoing, the Board concludes that the benefits from the granting of the variances substantially outweigh any detriment.

3. Additionally, the Board concludes that the variances can be granted without substantial detriment to the zone plan and zoning ordinance of the City of Plainfield. The proposed use is permitted by the LUO.

4. The Board further concludes that the variances 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 the requested bulk variances and supplemental zone variances. The Board accepts the assertion of the Applicant's Planner that the deviation from the front yard setback requirement will provide greater light, air and open space to the residential properties to the rear, as well as additional parking.

5. The Board finds that the design waiver requested, relating to private open space is reasonable and within the general purpose and intent of the provisions of the LUO. Literal enforcement of these provisions of the LUO are impracticable in these circumstances and will cause undue hardship because of peculiar conditions of the site.

6. 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 of **VIETREAL UNITED GROUP, LLC** for preliminary and final site plan approval; bulk variances related to: minimum front yard setback (5 feet) and maximum lot coverage (76.5%); supplemental zone variances related to: minimum parking lot buffering (no setback easterly parking area from the property boundary with a commercial lot), parking lot location (to the side of the proposed building), minimum number of parking spaces (34 parking spaces) and parking lot landscaping (no landscaping islands); and a design waiver from the LUO related to: private open space (no private open space above first floor); in order to develop the Applicant's Amended Project; 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 Professional Planner dated March 14, 2023, as follows:

1. Revision of the plans/reports and provision of information to the satisfaction of the Board's Professional Planner.

B. In accordance with the recommendations contained in the report from the Board Engineer dated January 4, 2023, last updated March 15, 2023, as follows:

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

C. Compliance with any reports and/or comments from the City Police Department to the satisfaction of the Department.

D. Compliance with any reports and/or comments from the City Fire Department to the satisfaction of the Department.

E. Compliance with any reports and/or comments from the City Shade Tree Commission to the satisfaction of the



Commission; including the provision of any required trees or a contribution to the Tree Fund in lieu thereof.

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

1. Removal of the two (2) billboards; and revision of the plans to reflect same;

2. Provision of uniform window treatments for all of the residential apartment units; and revision of the plans to reflect same;

3. Provision of cable television and internet connections for all of the residential apartment units; and revision of the plans to reflect same;

4. Preparation and recording of a consolidation deed to the satisfaction of the Board Professionals;

5. Prohibition of left turns from the Subject Property onto West Front Street; and revision of the plans to reflect same;

6. Inclusion of a provision in all residential leases prohibiting the installation of satellite dishes; and revision of the plans to reflect same;

7. Provision of bollards on the sides of the delivery/move-in/move-out area; and revision of the plans to reflect same;

8. Assignment one parking space adjacent to the rear of the building to each of the residential apartments; and revision of the plans to reflect same;

9. Assignment one parking space at the rear of the parking area to each of the residential apartments; and revision of the plans to reflect same; and

10. Modification of the architectural plans to relocate the second access door of the residential lobby further from the initial door to create a package delivery area.

## 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

Applicant shall pay any outstanding real estate taxes and assessments within fourteen (14) days of this Resolution and provide proof by an official search for municipal liens.

IV. FEES

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, if required.

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 MARCH 16, 2032:**

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

This Resolution adopted this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2023 memorializes the action taken at a meeting of the City of Plainfield Planning Board on March 16, 2023 with the roll call vote on the memorialization as follows:

**ROLL CALL ON MEMORIALIZATION**

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a Resolution of the City of Plainfield Planning Board memorialized on \_\_\_\_\_, 2023.

---

MAXIMO VAZQUEZ  
Planning Board Secretary