

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 14, 2023

Pursuant to rules of Council of the Town of Westfield, the members thereof convened in regular session Tuesday, February 14, 2023, at 8:00 p.m.

Mayor Brindle made the following announcements:

“The adequate notice of this meeting, as required by the Open Public Meetings Act, was provided by the posting, mailing, and filing of the annual notice of regularly scheduled meetings of the Town Council on December 13, 2022. The notice was, on that date, posted on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building, mailed to THE WESTFIELD LEADER, and THE STAR LEDGER, and filed with the Clerk of the Town of Westfield.”

PRESENT: Mayor Brindle, Councilmembers: Habgood, LoGrippo, Katz, Mackey, Contract, Dardia, Root

ABSENT: Councilman Parmelee

Invocation was given by Councilman Contract

Salute to the flag.

APPOINTMENTS

OPENING REMARKS

Mayor's Update

Good evening, and Happy Valentine's Day! Thanks to everyone who is joining us tonight both in person and online this evening. As a reminder, public comment will be accepted in person only, and we are live streaming for viewing only via Facebook. As always, the replay will also be available afterwards on Facebook, YouTube, and TV 36.

With the vast interest in tonight's vote on the Lord & Taylor/Train Station Redevelopment Plan, I'd like to take a few minutes to provide a bit of context and background on this complex project which touches on a variety of issues – downtown vitality, economic impact, traffic, revenue opportunity, financial risk mitigation, scale/density, and more. The significant level of engagement we've had with our residents, business owners, and downtown property owners is what we had always hoped for; however, the forest has often gotten lost through the trees when discussing the many details of the proposal. Let me recap for a moment how we got here and what this proposal is aiming to solve.

The One Westfield Place proposal is the culmination of four years of planning and collaboration with HBC | Streetworks Development and is the result of the public's input into a new Master Plan Reexamination that was unanimously adopted by the Planning Board and supported by the Town Council, along with subsequent input Streetworks received from numerous community groups with whom they met prior to the proposal's September introduction. Each of these planning milestones was discussed publicly and often, always with the goal of ensuring and encouraging resident engagement in the process. As The Westfield Leader noted in their editorial last week, "Any notion that any of this was a secret is bull."

In addition to the importance of public input, we have been guided by a top-tier team of redevelopment professionals in finance, law, parking, traffic, and planning, all of whom have proceeded with the Town's long-term best interest as their top priority. I recognize that we have many Westfield residents who are also professionals in these areas, and we have welcomed their input and received their full support in many instances. We are fortunate to have two long-term residents as part of our team of professionals, and a Westfield resident also led the Master Plan Reexamination process, his residency being a key reason why his firm was chosen. I say this to reiterate how important it has been to have the proposal reflect the voice and desires of Westfield residents, but at the end of the day recognizing that it's not possible to govern by committee. As elected officials, our obligation is to represent the interests of the community at large, and we believe the current One Westfield Place proposal, with the recent modifications made in response to public feedback, does just that.

There is no such thing as a perfect project, but we have strived to find a balanced proposal that addresses long-standing challenges that have gone ignored for decades while mitigating any potential negative impacts. Recommendations of a 1999 Downtown Improvement Plan submitted by the DWC to the Town Council and Planning Board were largely ignored, which included increasing building height and density, developing the L&T employee parking lots, evaluating every municipal parking lot for mixed use redevelopment in collaboration with private developers, and redeveloping the South Ave business district into a more pedestrian friendly commercial corridor to include structured parking and office buildings. Sound familiar? What followed was "kicking the can down the road," which finally caught up with us 15 years ago, resulting in many downtown vacant storefronts while surrounding communities were thriving. As previous administrations discovered, it's so much easier to say no than get to yes. But most of us on this dais did not seek office to maintain the status quo. We were elected to solve problems, and ensuring the long-term vibrancy of our downtown has always been a publicly stated top priority.

While some may disagree on the how, I am confident most agree on the goal of One Westfield Place. To deliver a downtown for the future – one that will feature a vibrant commercial hub for generations to enjoy; resolve long-standing traffic, parking, and congestion challenges; provide engaging spaces for community gathering, art, and events; and result in unprecedented new sources of commercial tax revenue. It is designed to celebrate the best of Westfield and reaffirm

the Town's long-standing reputation as one of the premier places to live in the State, anchored by a downtown that serves as a national model for a post-COVID Main Street community – one that meets the needs and desires of all residents and downtown businesses, including those who have been here for generations as well those who have just arrived.

Very importantly, One Westfield Place is a proposal that delivers over \$350mm in private investment in our downtown, \$54mm in public improvements, restores many of the 2,000 jobs that have been lost since 2015, and provides the ability to stabilize and potentially lower taxes over the long-term. Those are outcomes that every resident should welcome.

I also want to remind residents that tonight's vote on the Redevelopment Plan is by no means the final step in this process, and there is still a long way to go. If the RDP is approved tonight, many of the specific details will then be ironed out when the project is submitted for site plan approval with the Planning Board later this year. There will be no shovels in the ground until late next year at the earliest.

Before we get started, I'd like to briefly review the procedures for tonight's meeting. The ordinance related to One Westfield Place that we are voting on tonight is for final adoption of a Redevelopment Plan. As with any ordinance on second reading, we are required to hold a public hearing on the ordinance, with discussion and questions limited to its relevant specifics. In this case the RDP is a zoning ordinance, and comments should be related to topics it encompasses such as height, density, massing, etc. The Redevelopment Plan does not cover issues such as approval process, finance details, PILOTs, referenda, etc., and those comments should be reserved for the standard public comment period that will come later in the meeting, following the hearing and the Council's vote.

Anyone who comes to the microphone to speak during the ordinance hearing on a topic unrelated to the RDP will be asked to save those comments for the general public comment period.

The rules of how our meeting is conducted are established by Robert's Rules of Order, the widely recognized standards for parliamentary procedure. These rules, which include public comment serving as an intake mechanism for feedback, and not a Q&A, is standard, and has been for many years prior to this administration's governance. Simply put, this is nothing new. What is new is our attempt to respond to your comments and questions after the public comment portion is closed.

I also want to reiterate that decorum will be required and demanded at this meeting. Public outbursts from the audience, as we witnessed at the last meeting, will not be tolerated. Everyone deserves to be heard and respected, and we can and should do better.

I want to thank you all for being here, for your passionate points of view, and for your commitment to the civic process as we share the common goal of improving our hometown.

With that, let's get to work.

PRESENTATIONS

ADVERTISED HEARINGS

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 2023-03

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE LORD & TAYLOR/TRAIN STATION REDEVELOPMENT PLAN.”

Advertised returnable this evening.

Bill West, 663 Summit Avenue - Thank you for your time and dedication to the town, I know we do not always see eye to eye but appreciate your efforts. I have spoken about before against the size and scope of the One Westfield Place project for many reasons that were outlined at the Planning Board meeting. The height and density of the structures lack consistency with the Master Plan Reexamination Report or the Land Use Circulation Element. I'm going to talk about the traffic study and some inconsistencies tonight with the Master Plan. The desire in the Unified Land Use and Circulation Plan includes recommendations to improve traffic flow and minimize congestion. That desire is to have a level D service or better. Today we have as a result of the investigation by the traffic study the Kimley Horn traffic analysis, we have six intersections that are level E and F, which is unacceptable. The proposed One Westfield Place development level services are worse than the other 12 intersections at all levels E and F and are inconsistent with the Master Plan. We are adding 374 am cars to the peak rush hour and 492 pm cars to the highest peak rush hour. Together we're talking about 1,000 daily cars when you include the entire rush hours. This is certainly not inconsistent with the Master Plan. I don't subscribe to the transit-oriented development as pulled out of the master plan. The metric says that we reduce traffic based upon the location of our train station and specifically with respect to the South Avenue commercial building, stating that 30% of the employees that are in that building will take mass transit. I just don't believe 30% of the people working there are going to take the Raritan Valley Line to Westfield. I think you're going to have 95% of people driving to work. I saw the estimate there's 1,300 employees going into this 210 sq. ft building, and they are not going to take the train to Westfield on the Raritan Valley Line. There are some improvements recommended in the traffic study including the light at Clark Street and Fourth Avenue. It's going to reduce the Clark Street wait of course because they have a traffic light but that's going to increase the delays on North Avenue. Other improvements intuitively won't work. If eliminating the lane on South Avenue that is definitely going back in traffic on Central Avenue and South Avenue and Westfield circle that is really the biggest bottleneck backing up the whole town. Traffic flow will negatively impact Central and South Avenue and cause cut throughs on Washington, North Avenue, Park Street, Boulevard and South Avenue. I did see that they tried to reduce a lane on

North Avenue between North Avenue and Central but that did not work because it certainly will be backed up. There were also omissions in the Kimley Horn Report that will negatively impact traffic. Namely the Westfield Avenue, South Avenue intersection was not included in the study. That's a pretty significant intersection right there with the Westfield circle. 22 condos have gone up today. Everybody sees it on Central Avenue there is more building, so that's coming to Westfield. The Vermilla apartments in Garwood is omitted from the traffic study report that is right on the border of Westfield and is certainly going to have an impact. It should have been in the traffic study. In summary, there are six intersections right now that are unacceptable by the Master Plan levels E and F services. With the new developments combined with One Westfield Place with up to 12 intersections with a level of service of E and F. This is in conflict with the Master Plan Traffic impacts all resident's quality of life. I urge you to scale back this development's size and scope. Be consistent with our Land Use Ordinances and the Master Plan recommendations.

Ted Ritter, 710 North Avenue West - On a positive note I am a supporter of strategic context sensitive redevelopment. I did visit the One Westfield Place Preview Center and I read up on the development proposal as you suggested for both Lord & Taylor properties and the other locations that are part of this Redevelopment Plan. I think some of what's been proposed makes sense for the town and some in my opinion clearly doesn't. I know you think that the majority of the town supports this but I hear a lot, at the YMCA, in the supermarkets, emails from people that live here there is a lot of serious concerns about the scope and the scale, and the speed of this proposal is as it stands now, not a concept of redevelopment. I don't blame people at past meetings for being upset, because this is something that's super important to the town. It's transformative and polarizing. Yet so many reasonable steps could have been taken such as when Councilman LoGrippo, couldn't even get a second on two separate and certainly reasonable motions to pause and just take a little bit more time to get some specifics addressed before it's too late. As I told the folks in the preview center one of the key issues is the actual size of the Lord & Taylor property. Now it's big, obviously something's got to be done, no one is disputing that, but I think the way you look at the model and you see the scale of it in the context of that neighborhood, It's just too large for that spot. One thing that will be helpful is to recognize when putting together plans for the site is to remember that there are houses nearby, a lot of the other towns that have redeveloped concentrated most of their development in the downtown section where there really aren't neighborhoods right there. Lord & Taylor comes right up to the property line, and it would be great to have a little bit of a buffer there so that the people that live in my neighborhood are not looking out the window at this urban monstrosity. I think that if you want to get support, you got to recognize that not every redevelopment component, not every plan needs to be supersized like this. I think that the attractive townhouses that have been proposed on the Lord & Taylor properties where the employee parking lots were on the other side of the street or on the Y side of the street. I think those would make sense, but the problem is, if you look at

them, the permitted height is 75 feet. If you look at all those nice houses on Charles Street and in the surrounding neighborhood on Clark, they're not that big there. You need to make the townhouses look like they belong in that neighborhood, as opposed to having something that looks like it belongs in Jersey City. I think that will go a long way to scale that back and then there's a bit of a phasing. Versus suddenly just giant buildings in a neighborhood that is more residential. As for the reimaged site at Lord & Taylor, it's not that I don't accept that something's got to be done there, and the same thing with South Avenue area, there's a lot of property there, but I'm worried about all the traffic that is streamed down Boulevard, Summit, Westfield Ave, and Park Street. My wife and I have Ikea sized arguments about when we get stuck in traffic on Park and Central Avenue now. I can just imagine what it's going to be like after this. It would be nice before you approve, you see a few more specifics on things that we don't know about or don't have specifics, like about a pedestrian bicycle path over the railroad tracks. It's not a done deal. That's going to take some time to get done. We don't know where the Northside Fire Station is going to go yet. A lot of the traffic details that I asked about in the Preview Center couldn't be answered because we're not at that stage yet, well addressing issues like these now even if you say it's not time for that. Willingness to compromise, besides just making some decisions that have been made to reflect some public comment, I think it will go a lot longer to get some more support. So, on this Valentine's Day, show some love, pause the project, scale back and make it something for the town we love.

Frank Fusaro, 422 Stanley Avenue - Before you vote on the Redevelopment Plan, I want to make sure the entire Council is familiar with what happened with the Planning Board meeting last week, since only Mayor Brindle & Councilman Dardia sit on that Board. Residents pointed out almost 30 inconsistencies between the Redevelopment Plan and the Master Plan which were ignored by the Planning Board and their expert. One of the inconsistencies was significantly reducing the amount of required parking at the South Avenue office buildings well below the Master Plan recommendations instead of the Master Plans recommended 630 spaces. The developer is only going to be required to provide 525 spaces, which not coincidentally is the exact size of the developers proposed garage. Chris Colley from Topology tried to explain away this inconsistency by saying that the redevelopment agreement provides a minimum to maximum range of required parking and the Master Plan recommendations fall within that range. This clever attempt by Topology to avoid inconsistencies with the Master Plan recommendations doesn't work because you already know that the developer can barely meet the minimum range along the maximum range. There's no good reason that the Master Plan recommends at least 630 parking spaces for these size offices. There will be approximately 703 cars driving to the South Avenue offices daily with only parking for 525 cars, leaving 205 cars with no place to park. Those numbers are based on a developer's own estimates of tenants and visitors. The Redevelopment Plan is also inconsistent with the Master plan because it significantly reduces employee and commuter parking and does not add any shopper parking during weekday business

hours. You don't have to be an expert to see that the redevelopment plan is inconsistent with the Master Plan. This Council can't just blindly claim that you're relying on the Planning Board's resolution with the Town's experts. If you vote to approve this redevelopment plan tonight, you're knowingly ignoring the legal requirement that the Redevelopment Plan is to be consistent with the Master Plan. There are inconsistencies in the required parking. The Town also can't justify voting tonight to rezone for the South Avenue offices on the redevelopment agreement. We've heard over and over again that the reason for the offices on South Avenue is to create foot traffic "walking wallets" The town has no expert report or analysis that building offices will achieve that goal or qualifying how much those office workers will spend. Streetworks has reported that each office worker is projected to spend \$5,700 per year. This is completely unrealistic. How many office workers will just drive to work, eat lunch at their desk, or in a food service cafeteria that will no doubt be provided and then go home. It is a gross dereliction of your obligations to residents to vote to approve a plan that rezones South Avenue for offices and hopes that tenants will produce foot traffic when we have no expert analysis or report to support that. This redevelopment plan represents the town handing its future over to a developer. The redevelopment plan is easy to draft because it simply accommodates the plans of a developer who presumably is slated to be the designated redeveloper. You cannot designate a developer until you adopt a redevelopment plan. So, in the process you have followed is the exact opposite of what is supposed to be, in addition to a no bid process for the sale of the plan. Because of relaxed parking standards when development is complete the Town will have more congestion but likely to have the same difficulties in shoppers trying to find convenient parking. The Town Council is under the false impression that the redevelopment plan is substantially consistent with the Towns Master Plan, which was suggested by the Planning Board. The June 2021 Unified Land Use and Circulation Element of the Master Plan neglected to set a limit on redevelopment in downtown. It said that more intensity is recommended but never indicated what the height or residential density limit should be. We think this is a fatal flaw in the Master Plan. The Municipal Land Use Law says that a land use plan element is required to show the proposed intensity of development, saying simply that more intensive development is recommended without stating its limit is not a valid bounded land use plan. But the current wording of the 2021 Master Plan presumably the Town Council will say that a redevelopment plan that allows 20 story buildings was also consistent because it is "more intensive". The Land Use Plan should set limits.

Allison Carey, 408 East Dudley Avenue - In addition to what Mr. Fusaro said, I want to go back to the Planning Board for a minute. Our group spent a significant amount of time ourselves with subject matter experts, many of which you know, going through the Redevelopment Plan, the Master Plan and the Unified Land Use Circulation Element to make sure there were no inconsistencies. As Frank said, we found at least 30. We documented them. We sent them to the Planning Board. We went to the Planning Board meeting, and no one had

anything to say about it and frankly the lack of intellectual and professional curiosity from that Board was disappointing and really surprising. You can think the plan is great but the job here is to make sure it's consistent with the Master Plan. They unanimously voted in favor. As Frank stated, only two of you were at the Planning Board meeting. We sent this document to all of you last night, there's not a lot of time, but we didn't have a lot of time to look at the plan either. And we're back here voting on consistency with the Master Plan, not whether you like it or not your opinion, consistency with the Master Plan. I'm going to take a step back and kind of about the nature of the Master Plan and the findings that we had. The Westfield Advocates for Responsible Development reviewed the Lord & Taylor / Train Station Redevelopment Plan (the "Redevelopment Plan") to determine if it is substantially consistent with the Master Plan and the Unified Land Use and Circulation Element ("ULUC"). Based on the foregoing substantial inconsistencies, the Westfield Advocates for Responsible Development maintains that the Planning Board cannot determine that the Redevelopment Plan is substantially consistent with the Master Plan and the ULUC. In addition to specific substantial inconsistencies set forth in detail herein, overall, the Redevelopment Plan is substantially inconsistent with the values, and goals of the master plan. The Redevelopment Plan ignores the following Master Plan Guiding Principles within the ULUC:

1. "As we grow, we will strive to preserve the attributes of our unique, hometown character and community identity, the beauty of our natural environment, and the strengths of our neighborhoods, while lessening the adverse effects of growth"
2. "We will retain the best qualities of a small town and respects its heritage..."
3. "We value open space and parks as an integral part of our community's hometown feel and will take advantage of opportunities for its enhancement and expansion."
4. "We will maintain and enhance the historic and human orientation of our Downtown as the center of our community."
5. "We realize that architectural and land use design is fundamental to our identity..."
6. "We will preserve our single-family neighborhoods while providing housing choices that will allow people to age in place".

The Redevelopment Plan is also inconsistent with the overall Goals & Objectives within the ULUC in the following areas:

1. To provide adequate light, air, and open space by establishing, administering and enforcing bulk, density and design standards that are appropriate for the various zones and uses in the community."
2. To preserve and protect the suburban character of existing residential neighborhoods through:
 - a. Zone designations based upon existing neighborhood patterns and according to the environmental requirements for the respective residential uses.

- b. Bulk, density and design standards that are appropriate for various dwelling types and not overly intensive in relation to the lot(s) on which a dwelling is situated in their respective zones.
 - c. Discouraging through traffic in residential areas whenever possible.
 - d. Regulations to preserve and enhance visual appearance of residential neighborhoods.
3. Appropriate regulations to protect and/ or replace trees/woodland impacted by development projects.
4. To maintain and enhance the viability of the various business districts by:
 - a. Encouraging an appropriate mix of land uses that will complement one another and meet the retail and service needs of the Town.
 - b. Promoting a desirable visual environment and preserving the small-town atmosphere in the business districts.
 - c. Providing or requiring the provision of sufficient numbers of parking and loading spaces in the appropriate locations to serve the needs of the general public.

Edgar Charles, 16 Prospect Street - I am going to pick up where Allison left off and I will state there are numerous inconsistencies between the Redevelopment Plan and the ULUC.

3.2 Lord & Taylor Properties (GB-2 Zone): 3.2.A.1 West Zone – West Building the Redevelopment Plan proposes a fundamental change in use from business/retail to residential/business, which is substantially inconsistent with the ULUC. The bulk height is very tall with excessive density and total floor area of 170,000 SF. The building are 6 stories and 75 feet tall with a 70% density. There are step backs from the 4th thru the 6th floor that do not provide light to the sidewalk. Inconsistencies follow:

- Redevelopment Plan includes residential use in this redevelopment zone, and is in direct conflict with ULUC, Page 41, where it states the “The GB-2 Zone prohibits residential use of any kind”. The Plan is also inconsistent with the Land Use Ordinance (Land Use Ordinance), 11.27 for GB-2, prohibiting residential uses.
- This side yard setback is too close to the single-family residential homes on North Avenue. This creates a 70-foot-tall wall approximately 100 feet long and eliminates any privacy for the residents of the single family house. This is inconsistent with the Guiding Principles of the ULUC above regarding preserving residential neighborhoods.
- The Plan is also inconsistent with the Dec 2019 Master Plan Reexamination Report (pages 82 & 83), as follows: “Prohibited Uses in the GB-2 Zone the Issue: In the GB-2 Zone, residential use of any type should not be permitted. The same uses prohibited in the CBD and GB-1 zone districts should be prohibited in the GB-2 zone. What has Changed: The existing regulations found at Section 11.27 (“GB-2 District”) subsection D.4 do not permit residential uses. This objective of the 2002 Master Plan is resolved”. The

buildings are ‘overly intensive in relation to the lot(s) on which a dwelling is situated in their respective zones’.

- Since this use is prohibited, GB-2 Residential density is not defined. The maximum allowable in the GB2-AHO Affordable Housing Overlay District (the L&T is not part of this district), is 25 dwelling units per acre. With a total available lot area of approximately 194,372 sq. ft. (4.4 acres) excluding remaining L&T building, at 138 units, this is 6 dwellings/acre higher than that requirement, or a 20% increase in current standards for that GB2-AHO zone.
- Redevelopment Plan page 21 includes “Coverage by buildings an above ground structures shall not exceed 70% of total coverage” Land Use Ordinance 11.27 for GB-2, para-E.4. only allows for 40%. This is substantially inconsistent with the ULUC to ensure consistency with (Goal #2). “Bulk, density and design standards that are appropriate for various dwelling types and not overly intensive in relation to the lot(s) on which a dwelling is situated in their respective zones.” A comparison of existing GB-2 zoning requirements to the proposed rezoning under the Redevelopment Plan is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- Redevelopment Plan page 21 – The Proposed height of the West Building is significantly inconsistent with the ULUC by exceeding the proposed change to maximum height of 55’ contained in the ULUC (page 27) by 36% to 75’ (87% higher than the current Land Use Ordinance of 40’). This is substantially inconsistent with any other zoning.
- Redevelopment Plan, page 22, 24 and 30, state that the structures “.... may be built with or without Skyways”. Nowhere in the ULUC or within the Reexamination Report Dec 2019 or Westfield’s Land Use Ordinance permits construction of a pedestrian Skyway on any parcel. This is in conflict with the ULUC Guiding Principles 2 and 8
- The maximum GFA for residential consisting of 170,000 Sq ft is excessive and should be brought in line with the 16-24 dwelling units/acre. Redevelopment plan doubles the height, increases the allotment coverage, and permits residential usage not currently contemplated in the ULUC.
- 3.2.A.2 West Zone – Center Building: The bulk height is very tall with excessive density and total floor area of 150,000SF. The buildings are 4 stories and 75 feet tall with a 70% density.
- Redevelopment Plan page 24 – The Proposed height of the Central Building is significantly inconsistent with the ULUC by exceeding the proposed change to maximum height of 55’ contained in the ULUC (page 27) by 36% to 75’ (87% higher than the current Land Use Ordinance of 40’).

David Veca, 222 Midwood Place - What cities are denser San Diego or Westfield? What about Austin, Texas, Atlanta, Houston, Phoenix, Dallas, Denver, Tampa. I think you know. How long have we been this dense? We have slightly less people today than we did in 1960? We've always

been this dense for pretty much everyone's entire adult life here and much longer than mine. I came here tonight largely to avoid pre-fixed menus, but also to try and figure out something that has been bothering me. Here we have a Town Council that is reducing bureaucratic overhead, working with a private enterprise to boost local investment on a plan that is wildly popular with local business. And it is wildly unpopular with the town's Republican caucus and some small c conservatives from either party around town. Part of the reason that Westfield's capital improvement stagnated is because of overly restrictive zoning. I understand the urge for restrictive zoning. Westfield is nice, we want to keep it that way. So, you put guard rails up to make sure we can protect the town from ourselves. I think this is government overreach. You're telling us what we can and can't do with our property, setting strict guidelines for businesses and it stops us as a region from solving some very real problems, like effectively forcing a large portion of our neighbors out of town when they retire and pricing out young families who might not have the same access to capital as those around this room do today. We have a local government body here that's breaking down the barriers to let the free market breathe a little bit in downtown Westfield. We're taking land that is currently highly restricted in use and rezoning in a way that allows it to be developed with diversity and mixed-use space. All other things equal, a square that can only hold cars is less valuable than the same square that can hold both cars, restaurants, businesses, entertainment venues and so forth. It is unnecessarily so because the value of a parking lot is included in the existing square and the proposed change. By removing these barriers, we are increasing the value of our land and all the land surrounding it yours and mine.. But I don't see any of these concerns truly addressing the zoning or the development. What changes are they proposing to the project that will lead to greater value creation for the town for all of us. It doesn't create more value for all of us and instead blunts that value by protecting the status quo or prioritizing strict land use ordinances, you still have to hear me talk at these meetings. If it doesn't bring value for all Westfielders just not just colonial Westfield, small town Westfield or whatever restrictive Westfield you prefer, I am against it. I want to be sure I'm getting this right. But thank you to the Democrats who are reducing the role of government in our lives by loosening up restrictive zoning to allow corporate development downtown.

Rob Galgano, 939 Boulevard - Without reservation. I am in favor of this redevelopment plan as it is regarding community input no one can deny there was a tremendous amount of civic engagement and openness. The information is out there easily accessible. However, there is no denying that there's been some opposition to this plan. I have found the opposition's approach personally to be disordered and frenetic. Additionally, I'm going to note that in light of the recent poll by TapInto Westfield, the opposition could not muster more than 849 theoretically valid, no votes in a community of over 30,000 residents.

Bob McNamara, 603 Lawrence Avenue - I've lived in Westfield for 32 years. I've spoken to the Town Council and the Planning Board and want to just quickly talk about two items. The first is solar studies. I had asked if anybody had done solar studies of the Lord & Taylor site. I didn't hear that anybody actually did. So, I went and did it myself. For most of the year in the afternoon, that East building of Lord & Taylor is going to cast a shadow over our monuments and memorials in Memorial Park. I think that that's really disappointing. This goes to the height of the East building at six stories, so close to Memorial Park. It's really a shame that we're not looking at this pushing it back away from the memorials. As I said, most of the afternoon they're in shadow, even to the extent that it's going across North Avenue significantly, and I think we need to really address the height, at least of the East building. The other thing I wanted to talk about are the parking garages. As I mentioned previously, THA is your engineering consultant. On their own website, they recommend a minimum length for a parking garage at 238 feet. For improved efficiency they suggest 278 feet. The present proposed South parking garage has a depth of only 170 feet, so we're 68 feet less than the minimally efficient footprint. The North structured parking garage is even worse. Its depth at its longest is 13 feet, but it narrows down to 156 feet where it abuts against the residential portion of that site. It's 82 feet less than an efficient garage proposed. There is also the issue of how you access the other residential section, you go through our parking garage to service that building is really poorly planned. As we know construction, less efficiency translates to more construction dollars. In essence the developer has forced us to accept two insufficient sites for these garages. They are simply too small. Also relative to the footprint size the Master Plan Reexamination report addresses a vision for parking garages within the town. This is on pages 113 and 114. It's actually very well written and a nice vision for our town. It talks about thinking about their uses in decades into the future, talking about the putting ramps on the outside of the parking garage adding flat floors for the real parking garage so they could be converted to a residential and office use in the future. Talking always about being able to think in the future. As I stated the proposed footprints are very small it won't have an outer ramp. The Read Report states also standalone structures take away from the design fabric of the street and I'm quoting from the Reexamination report. The South parking garage is in fact a standalone parking garage. The Read Report also talks about garages being wrapped by other uses. Again, this objective is ignored in the plan that the developer is forcing us to accept. It won't meet the objectives of the reexamination report. The Read Report basically says Westfield does not want you to build these structures only to have them sit there as monuments to the past. That's a great objective. But we fail with this redevelopment to meet that objective.

Jim Boyes, 122 Ferris Place - While I do not expect there to be much suspense in tonight's vote, I do feel it's important to offer my comments for the record. The primary issue before this Town Council is consistency of the Streetworks Redevelopment Plan with the Town Master Plan. For without consistency with the Master Plan, as the Town Planner has informed us, no development

plan should move forward. So, this is an essential question and one that must be answered carefully and confidently. Mayor & Council have repeatedly told us that they will use the Master Plan Reexamination Report as the guidebook. And on the surface that makes sense. However, I contend that any fair reading of that document does not lead to a project of the size and scale as being voted on tonight. While there was a recommendation to increase building heights in the Central Business District from 40 to 55 feet, which I support, nowhere in that document for you to find any reference to building heights 75 feet and in fact even higher with the addition of rooftop mechanical equipment. Moreover, residents expressed a clear preference away from five to six story structures. Tonight's proposal is by and large comprised of five and six story structures. These buildings are excessive, unnecessary, and inconsistent with the desires of the Master Plan respondents. And by the way, many of these are the same respondents who signed both petitions against the two recent developments. They feel they were duped and never expected their sentiments to be manipulated and ultimately used against them. I was once a proponent of local Redevelopment and Housing Law, and I must confess I'm much less so today. I'm seeing how the process can be twisted and contorted to greenlight any size development. Even the Sears Tower is to say one reference to "open to the possibility of building higher" and it's off to the races. There are no boundaries in place. Having recently viewed examples of five story development in a suburban town of maybe three story structures. All I can say is it makes for a shocking contrast. That feeling is less wow and more whoever thought that was a good idea. It draws away from the contextual field of our properly planned, holistic town. I can only imagine the reaction to seeing a six story building next to a residential home. I don't think Westfielders were calling for this type of development in the Master Plan. For this reason, I asked you to slow down everything before moving ahead.

Susan Goodman, 322 Orenda Circle - I have been walking the Town. I go out three or four times a week, two to three hours at a time, thirty to forty houses each time and twenty to twenty-five people answer their door. They don't want five and six story buildings at Lord & Taylor or anywhere on the property on the North and South side of the railroad station. People are worried, especially the people on North Avenue. They are worried that they cannot pull out of their driveways because the traffic is going to be too busy. They don't think that the town square will be sufficient especially if it's going to be an in and out to get to the North side of the train station and possibly for that parking lot at the North and Central area. Because you may not be able to have any other entrance in and out to get to that large parking lot. They feel they don't want to give up their surface parking spaces for two large garages. Those people on North Avenue, Boulevard, Summit, Westfield, and Charles Street don't want to be looking at those buildings. They don't want to look out their back windows and see the back of that building that's going in the parking lot across from the Lord & Taylor building. They want to be able to have their children be able to safely ride their bikes around town and go to their friend's house without worrying about the traffic. They don't believe you're going to get a walkway over Route 28 by

the 911 Memorial because it probably will not get past the Department of Transportation. These are people that know that it's a ridiculous idea. They want the stores downtown to be filled. They don't want extra retail. They don't want extra commercial space. You go with me Mayor Brindle and Council people, go door to door with me and listen to what people have to say Today, I went to twenty-five houses on Edgewood, twenty answered their door. Every single one says this project scares the hell out of them and they want it paused and they want it rethought. If you really want to hear what your residents want and four to seven years from now, you don't want people to be scared of what's happening to their town or say why in the hell did this happen? I didn't sign up for this.

Sam Altman, 15 South Wickom Drive - I am an 11th grader at Westfield High School. The previous speaker mentioned walking around to thirty to forty houses a day. My colleagues and I have also spoken to fifty to seventy students a day for the past week. These students want a downtown where they can go shopping, or a place to go for a whole day instead of just to grab a quick bite. These students want a downtown that can offer them men's clothes that they do not have to go all the way to Menlo Park for. These students want a place where they can hang out with their friends, instead of just sitting at home. That's what the students want. As a couple of the previous speakers have said redevelopment allows for this density, allows for a commercial source to come in and allows for the stores that offer the students what they want. This redevelopment increases the value and really takes advantage of the space that we have in Westfield. It really takes advantage that it will complement all things, for stores, for the commercial office space, for parking. I've heard a lot about the inconsistencies with the Master Plan, but downtown is a part of our identity. Redevelopment sure isn't part of our identity downtown. Yet these buildings in our downtown are critical and important for restaurants, culture and identity. Letting this downtown die by keeping these building restrictions with redevelopment is actually going to do more harm for our identity than good. Reinvesting in the downtown will allow students to spend a whole day and pour into these stores to really revitalize downtown. I urge this Council to move forward with this Redevelopment Plan.

Robbie Motwani, 772 Prospect Street - Everything that can be said about this project has already been said. I support this transient oriented development that will maximize our residential, business, and leisure space that stays within walking distance of public transportation. I ask that you all vote yes to move this project forward.

Tony LaPorta, 409 North Chestnut Street - I have a lot of concerns about this redevelopment. I was at the Planning Board meeting, and they were given a 38-page document. A masterful document taking apart the Redevelopment Plan, brick by brick because it doesn't mesh with the

Master Plan. I was on the Planning Board for six years, appointed by former Mayor Tom Jardim. Not one serious question was asked of the speakers. Two speakers spoke. Not one serious question was asked to the speakers of this 38-page masterful document. Not one, I couldn't believe what I was hearing. It basically was the definition of a rubber stamp. Then I spoke to the Mayor and Councilman Dardia. I said they didn't belong on this hearing. Conflict of interest, why? It is the mayor's plan. She sat here in secret for four years. Of course, builders and developers don't like parking lots. Why? Because there's nothing built there. There's no income for them. There's nothing for them to do and I've heard these developers talk at length about the unusefulness of parking lots. I was a commuter for 37 years. A parking lot is good to park your car and you go get off the train and you come back. You want to sell the parking lot for \$10.4 million and what are you going to do? You're going to replace it for close to \$30 million with two useless parking decks. One we heard was undersized and the other was rejected in 1999. Your own report that the town paid for the Rich Report it threw out that location on North and Central. And this is what you want to give us. There's a utilization for that parking lot to park cars for commuters. You're going to sell something for \$10.4 million and replace it with a worse product for over \$30 million and you know there's going to be maintenance and you know the DPW will be in there cleaning it out and you know the police will be there. It's unsafe. You want to get off a train at 12 o'clock at midnight. You really want to jump off the train and get into a parking garage. You want your wife, your children? No, I don't think so. So, it's replacement costs. It makes no sense at the very minimum those lots should be sold for \$30 million. The replacement costs to replace it for utilization. Let's talk about the exit. I believe Councilman LoGrippe asked the Planner and the Developers what if the exit on that northern part of the North side parking lot is not approved by the County. What's your plan? They have no plan because there's no good answer. You're not going to put it on North Avenue and you're not going to go the other way because there is not enough space that's going to be going in. I truly believe Mayor that little rascals on their worst day can come up with a better plan that you have here.

Rafael Betancourt, 233 Golf Edge - 38-year resident and I want to commend the Mayor and Council for coming forward with a project that is going to be invested in the community. I'm just not sure that the project as proposed is what's best for this community. The density is really going to clog this community as Cranford has clogged, Scotch Plains has clogged, as many of our neighboring communities are clogged. The community is asking for a pause. You've done a great job so far. All you have to do if you're so sure, this is going to come forward and succeed. And it's going to be your will, you are the elected officials. You have the right to make this decision. If you're so certain that this decision is a done deal, why not give the community a pause? Give us some 60,90 120 days. I'm not walking around the town, but I certainly talk to people often. People are confused, they're uninformed and having a place downtown was a great idea, but how many of us go downtown? Not many. Westfield downtown is a place where we go eat but there's really not much more to do there. So, give us a pause. Give us the time to think

this through. You might get the communities to support this project. You don't know at this juncture. If the community is accepting this project and as an elected official, I would want to know that the community that I represent is approving the project proposal.

Dan Ortolani, 727 Glen Avenue - I just wanted to offer some brief comments in support of the redevelopment project. Specifically, the aspect of the plan that will create new office space. I recently attended a session at the Preview Center and the detailed concepts that were provided regarding the new proposed office buildings was particularly helpful to me in understanding the scope and financial benefits of this aspect of the project. Creating a more diversified tax base is essential to easing or at least containing the long-term burden on the town's residents. Also, the emphasis on connecting the new offices to downtown is critical for both our local businesses and the future corporate tenants. I understand they will need to be secured prior to the start of construction. I have some direct experience with this recently. I was asked by my company to assess office space in the New Jersey area here for about 125 tech workers. We looked at some space in the Metro Park area, which is thought to be the premier office Corporate Center. The buildings were beautiful. They had gyms, cafeterias. I think the gentleman who was here earlier mentioned that the workers want to just drive in and eat at their desk every day. These were beautiful buildings; however, they were all empty. The parking lots were desolate. The buildings were hollowed out. They're disconnected from any community. I don't think there's lots of office parks coming back. As a return to office trends for corporations gain momentum, companies will be searching for office space with access to transportation, modern amenities and connections to the local community where team members can live, work and spend at our local businesses. I think there's a major opportunity in front of us. I think the proposal has the potential to establish the town as a leader in attracting new companies to the area and driving associated benefits to our tax base and businesses.

Carla Bonacci, 603 Lawrence Avenue - 32-year resident. I wanted to bring this back up to the Master Plan and the impetus for doing this Redevelopment Plan
That you have spent so much time doing. Here's a description that I hope I can read. Westfield is a thriving community with a strong school system, numerous parks and recreational areas and a variety of shopping and dining options. Downtown area is particularly popular with its mix of independent shops, restaurants and cafes. It is also known for its well-preserved historic architecture, with many homes and buildings dating back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In addition to this charming downtown, Westfield is also known for its excellent schools and quality of life. Overall, Westfield is a charming, affluent, suburban town known for its beautiful homes, excellent schools and vibrant downtown and I don't think anyone here would disagree with that description. The source is fairly young. It condenses the wisdom of innumerable data points on the internet. And yes, I asked a chat GPTAI about Westfield's

reputation and that is what came up, so I think we're in good hands. I believe the concern is that all the Westfield virtues are being put at risk by grafting a massive and rezoning a redevelopment plan in the center of town. I know we all have serious concerns about the downtown retail vacancy rate and the desire to keep the town growing and adapting. And we would like to allow for transit-oriented development. The problem with this plan is that the voluntary site is not compatible with Westfield's strong neighborhood character; evidenced by everyone talking about six story buildings and in a three-story town. We have wondered if there's some major crisis that we don't know about. Some legal mandates or fiscal cliff that we are unaware of are driving a rezoning program of this magnitude at warp speed. That's making you think that our town is dying and saying that on national news. That's a lovely way to help our reputation. We are an affluent town; we have a solid residential tax base. We are not at risk of a doom scenario. We can also realize this opportunity to sell off development rights to build out some modest public space and traffic improvements. I said before the 5.61-acre site, you're basically giving him another 5.61 acre site by allowing him three stories of air rights and you're not getting enough money for that. You are not, so you need to look at that. I wish it would just be three stories. We would probably all go away, and you would be happy about that. I also want to say we've already demonstrated how this plan is inconsistent with the Master Plans vision statements. We have asked for a pause to develop alternative plans and potential impacts. We do believe Topology has the burden of proof that they could do a better job with the rezoning and Redevelopment Plan, not ever vacant parking lot is a parking lot not making money. It actually serves a purpose. I think this is an inflection point. Whether Westfield in 20 or 30 years should still resemble what it has been for the past 70 years, building upon and maintaining its current character, its reputation, its best qualities, or go down the path to create two distinct environments, a self-contained inner own core with urban scale density embedded within our town and perhaps holds on to its classic suburban residential experience. We don't want such a tale of two towns. We are not a city. We are not Denver. We are not Austin. We are Westfield 30,000 people, 22,000 adults, a lot of children that currently don't have anything to do downtown. I don't think they're going to be hanging out on the 5.61-acre site for 55+. Our strength is beautiful homes, strong schools, numerous open spaces and a vibrant downtown. I believe we should evolve by building on our core strengths, our values, our reputations, you have a very high-risk project. You're going to change the nature of this town. It's obvious that is what you want to do, but as Susan said, we have canvassed so many people, we wish you did the same.

Unknown Resident - I have lived here for almost 30 years. I am retired and my wife wanted to move, I told her no, Westfield is the perfect place. I want to spend the rest of my life here because this is a very unique, quiet, beautiful town. Probably one of the most beautiful places in the United States. I would like to stay here. Change is needed but not this big a change. Not five, six story buildings. There should be a consistency within the town. We want consistency and a beautiful downtown without large style buildings. We do need development and I support change. We should try to keep the style and consistency of the town instead of changing it and

becoming another Hoboken. People will move out if the style changes. We love Westfield and want to live here for the rest of our lives.

Arlene Gardner, 634 Carlton Road - I have been in communication with some of you and have visited the Preview Center twice. One Westfield Place redevelopment as proposed has much to recommend. No one wants the Lord & Taylor building to remain stagnant. That was the starting point. I think we all agree on that. It does make sense to look at development holistically. I have to agree that the proposal is too big and particularly too high. I see the other side which is probably the only way this works financially. I think we're looking for a balance. I think if you build less the town would get less money. Maybe we should think about that. I'm still not convinced that we need more age-restricted rental units as opposed to condos and I don't think we need a big office building altogether. However, if the redevelopment agreement has flexibility for the nature of what's going to be built at Lord & Taylor, if it can be built to be either condo if that's what's necessary, because that's what everybody keeps telling me. That will be useful. I've been told the agreement should not allow the developer to even purchase the South Avenue parking lot property, let alone development until the Lord & Taylor area has been developed, until the North side parking lot has been developed, most importantly, until they actually have tenants for that building. Nobody wants another empty building, we who live here don't want it, you don't want it, I don't think an HBC wants it. With those requirements, if they're in the redevelopment agreement, I think it provides a certain amount of protection for everybody. So, thank you Linda for explaining that. My remaining concern is traffic safety at the corner of South and Central. I can appreciate the interest in having on street parking for short term shoppers if we no longer have the flat surface parking. But the idea of taking away the third lane just sounds like an invitation for a traffic problem. I remember when we didn't have that third lane and it was worse. So, I don't know why people would consider that. I suggest to you that maybe the town can keep the surface parking which is basically behind Westfield Seafood. I don't know if that was part of what was being sold. Maybe that could be saved for short term parking for shoppers and that would solve the problem you would have with on street parking which is less safe anyway. You wouldn't have to get rid of a lane. Let's not make the traffic worse. My last thought is, and I don't know that this is part of the whole picture but on the corner of South and Central lies abandoned Jiffy-Lube. It's been abandoned for at least a decade if not more. It is truly an eyesore. I think it actually meets the definition of blight. I would urge the Town Council to do something about that. If anything needs to be developed it is that building.

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Brindle declared the hearing closed.

Councilman Contract

I'd like to like to first thank every resident who has engaged in the One Westfield Place proposal and took the time to learn about its many details. I realize this takes time but it's very important to understand all aspects of a complex proposal like this to make an informed judgment. One of my goals in this process as your Ward 3 Councilman has been to aid your evaluation by sharing detailed summaries of meetings and presentations so you can look at the project holistically and weigh the project's tradeoffs.

Regarding my vote tonight, I first thought about the opinions of Ward 3 residents who I represent. And after hearing from many of my constituents, feedback is pretty evenly split. This project unsurprisingly has evoked lots of support and an equivalent amount of opposition.

Since Ward 3's opinion is split, I then decided how to vote based on the advice I gave to Ward 3 residents regarding how to evaluate a project like this. This boils down to answering three key questions:

Step 1: Does this project address critical town goals?

Step 2: What are the project's pros/cons and do the pros outweigh the cons?

Step 3: Are the cons sufficiently mitigated to ensure the project delivers more benefit than downside to the community?

Here are my brief answers to these questions:

Step 1: Does the project address critical town goals. The answer to me is YES. One of town's top priorities and something I campaigned on back in 2017 and again last year is fixing our downtown vacancy issue. The root cause of this issue is the lack of foot traffic Mon-Fri exacerbated by the loss of more than 2,000 jobs since 2015. This proposal addresses this issue head-on with the addition of 1350 office workers as well as hundreds of new residents. This will help make up for the loss of workers in Westfield and help fuel business demand during the week which downtown businesses desperately need. Other nearby towns like Cranford, Summit, Princeton, & Metuchen recognized this years ago and pursued mixed use developments successfully to fuel their downtowns. There's a reason why downtowns in these municipalities are thriving and Westfield's isn't. Westfield can now catch up and move ahead of these other towns with One Westfield Place

The project also delivers on other town goals like improving parking downtown, diversifying the town's tax base (currently 92% of taxes are borne by residents, the highest in Union County), investing heavily in public improvements and traffic infrastructure which the current municipal budget can't support and adding more diverse housing options.

Step 2: What are the pros/cons. As I've said all along, there's no such thing as a perfect project so it's important to evaluate the pros/cons. To me, the chief pros include:

-- Fuels demand downtown Mon-Fri which is desperately needed

-- Improves parking by adding two parking garages plus incremental capacity on nights/weekends in the office buildings

-- Significantly increases investments in public improvements. This project funds \$54mm of public improvements through projected PILOT revenues including the 2 parking garages, two new beautiful public spaces – one on each side of the train station -- major traffic circulation and safety improvements at 10 intersections and much more.

-- Strengthens and diversifies town revenue sources. The PILOT is projected to deliver \$214mm of total incremental revenue to the town over 30 years. \$70mm or so is dedicated to funding the \$54mm of public improvements, which leaves \$140mm leftover to help stabilize taxes, fund other public improvements like a new firehouse, help fund BOE capital projects and more.

To me the major con is greater traffic. However, I believe that if we want to improve the economic vitality of our downtown, more traffic is to be expected since the downtown needs more people working and living there. Another major con expressed to me is the size/scale of the Southside buildings.

When I evaluate the pros and cons, I think the pros greatly outweigh the cons.

Lastly, are the cons sufficiently mitigated. And I believe they have been.

For traffic, I believe that the dozens of planned traffic improvements will mitigate this impact. There will be more cars coming to Westfield, but the proposed improvements greatly improve traffic flow and circulation to mitigate their impact. I think it's also important to keep in mind that it's in Streetworks best interest to ensure that Westfield doesn't turn into one big traffic jam. Do you think any company will want to lease space or any future resident will want to rent one of the new townhouses or apartments if North and South Avenue resemble parking lots? I don't think so.

I also want Ward 3 residents to know that the traffic mitigation process isn't finished. Based on your concerns, I've advocated for Streetworks and the town to study the impact of this project on Central Avenue and potential cut-throughs on Boulevard/Summit and identify potential mitigations. And I'm happy to announce that this project will be undertaken with preliminary results available in several months.

Regarding size/scale, I think it's important to recognize that the town's Master Plan call for greater heights along the train tracks than the CBD to maximize economic development as long as the buildings have step-backs. And the proposed buildings have up to 15' step-backs at the 3rd floor. The buildings will also have 12-20' setbacks or sidewalks so they won't hug the sidewalks either.

Based on my three-step approach, I think this project is a big win for Westfield, brings far more benefit than drawback, and does sufficiently mitigate the drawbacks. It's not a perfect project - - but nothing is – but it represents a major leap forward for Westfield and our downtown without

changing the other major things we love about our town including our wonderful neighborhoods and tree-lined streets, outstanding schools, and friendly residents.

As such, I'll be voting yes on the redevelopment plan.

Mayor Brindle

Before we move on, I would like Chris Colley from Topology and Town Planner, Don Sammet to address some of the questions that came up this evening. In particular, some of the comments that came up about documents submitted and inconsistency with the Master Plan, height, density, and traffic. I also heard someone mention the Townhouses across from Lord & Taylor were going to be 75 ft, can you just address that as well.

Chris Colley, Topology

The Townhouses are up to 40 feet. We did review the 38-page document that was referenced tonight. We reviewed it before the Planning Board meeting and again this evening. A lot of the memo discusses consistency between the GB-2 zoning and CBD zoning which are existing zoning districts for these properties and the proposed zoning under the redevelopment. Just as a matter of procedure, the Redevelopment Plan supersedes the CBD and the GB-2 zoning for these properties. It removes that existing zoning in places and uses the redevelopment plan that was recommended in the Master Plan. The Master Plan has very in my mind specific recommendations related to what the new zoning requirements shouldn't for the properties that are the subject of this Redevelopment Plan. It's not simply a sort of repeal of the existing. There are detail provisions in there in the Community Forum plan, which we went through in our prior presentations. That's what really informs the standards here. That's what we found in our Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the Master Plan standards and the Redevelopment Plan. This is the critical or a critical element of consistency. As it relates to the goals and objectives and the guiding principles, we took those very seriously. At the Planning Board hearing, we went through every goal and objective as well as the guiding principles and discussed consistency with them. I still believe that the plan is consistent with those and that was the finding of the Planning Board as well. I do want to address the parking recommendation directly, specifically as it relates to parking. So, the Master Plan recommendations on page 79 states in the Redevelopment Plan for redevelopment areas of downtown Westfield should take into consideration the following recommendations. One of those recommendations, the third bullet point is to "take into consideration the recommendations made in THA consultants Parking Plan and that's a document that's located at the end of the Master Plan. That THA document has parking requirements that are recommended for the CBD zone. The Master Plan does not state that redevelopment plans should whole cloth adopt and implement those recommendations exactly as they're written into the Redevelopment Plan. It says it should be taken into consideration and I don't want there to be this impression that we were flippen and

without taking those into consideration and created minimums and maximums just for the sole purpose of incorporating THA's recommendations. The parking standards that are included in this plan, including for the office, were carefully thought through. They did take into consideration the recommendations of THA. It was stated that Topology knows exactly how much the parking that the redeveloper will build and that's where the minimum came from. I think it's critical for people to understand where we are in this process as it relates to office parking. If this plan is adopted, and Streetworks is designated or anyone for that matter, is designated with an RDA, they are going to take that and they're going to go to market and they're going to try to find tenants and those tenants and Streetworks will need to operate a range of the parking standards that are in here. Their tenant might require 2.8, 3.2, 3.5, there's standards that are in the Redevelopment Plan that the redeveloper and the ultimate tenant. One last thing on that note, there's also in the Redevelopment Plan, safeguards to prevent a redeveloper from over committing parking. We wanted to make sure the plan was written in such a way that in a redeveloper commits parking to tenants in excess of what they have, that the town has some protection against that. so that is one of the requirements in the Redevelopment Plan Office Report, which is referenced on page 59 of the document. What that requires is that prior to building permits for office buildings being greater than 50,000 square feet a redeveloper needs to submit leases or equivalent documentation demonstrating the amount of square foot square footage and the quantity of parking they have committed to that tenant. If based on that there's insufficient parking to accommodate the peak hour demand, they need to make adjustments accordingly and return to the Planning Board to either adjust demand or adjust supply. We took into consideration the recommendations of THA very seriously. We set standards that we think are appropriate. We think they will mitigate potential impacts within the town, and we think they're also responsive to the market and likely to be in line with what a potential tenant would need.

Councilman LoGrippe

Can you tell us how you came up with the one-to-one commuter parking? I have heard throughout my many years on Council that residents are interested in more commuter parking. You talk about the businesses, but the taxpayers who commute into the city want to know why there isn't more commuter parking. Right now, I think it is even, but why not have more commuter parking?

Chris Colley, Topology

What this plan does in public parking is lays out where public parking would be and estimates of the number of parking spaces. This plan does not govern specifically how public parking is going to be managed or how public parking is going to be operated, or frankly even the exact number of public parking spaces that are going to be created. That's going to be a process that has been underway and is underway. There is a lot of documentation about it on the town's website. The Redevelopment Plan is setting office parking standards. The Redevelopment Plan is not setting

commuter parking requirements. It's laying out areas where public parking can be. The actual construction, design, and operation of those garages is something the Town would do.

Councilman Contract

It is hard to gauge the future of parking because we're coming out of the pandemic. We've talked about the need to balance not building too much parking but not building too little parking. I think despite this flexibility, there are contingencies built into the parking plan. If the projections right now change, there can be changes to the public parking. You can add more spaces or add another height to the garage to add more spaces. I think we all understand that we're trying to see into a crystal ball and try to figure out what makes the most sense 70 years from now. So, I'm satisfied that we have contingencies built in. If we need more computer parking, it can be created.

Mayor Brindle

Chris, as a professional Planner, what is the thought and the purpose and best-case use for a surface parking lot.

Chris Colley, Topology

So, it takes us back a couple years. The first thing we did in this process was evaluate whether or not these properties qualified as an area in need of redevelopment and the baseline for one of our key arguments earlier was that surface parking in downtown areas represents obsolescence use and that's an argument which reports explain in much more detail. That's an argument that we felt very comfortable making and an argument that is supported by case law. There is a case, *Citizens v. Princeton* a case that deals specifically with that question as to whether or not surface parking in downtown is obsolete and qualifies an area in need of redevelopment. In my professional opinion, surface parking surrounding train stations is certainly not the highest and best use and we made the argument then and I stand by it being an obsolete use.

Jim Zullo, THA Consultants

Parking has obviously been a main topic. The NJ transit ridership is still at 50% pre COVID levels, and a lot of people think that has kind of settled as possibly the new norm, but no one knows. The one thing I want to talk about is some of the contingencies. Right now, I believe the Public Parking Plan kind of gets continually morphed as ideas come through and other suggestions and other opportunities. There were computer spaces in the lot eight, three and 599 are physically contemplated to be replaced. There are available spaces underutilized in lot six, the Waterson Street lot which is basically about 50% empty today, making up that additional 25 spaces from there. Basically, the replacement for availability of all the commuter parking that exists today is anticipated to exist post development. That said the town will have continual

monitoring before shovels are in the ground for utilization, commuter parking, employee parking, and downtown parking to look at what the demand trends are, so that adjustments can be made. As mentioned, there are contingency plans to possibly provide more available parking for commuters.

Councilman LoGrippe

People in Westfield all commute to the city in different ways, some go from Linden, some go out of Jersey City. If we finally do get a direct train into the city 10 years from now there is going to be a larger demand for parking. Once this is built, and the demand is higher this is going to spill into the residential areas. There isn't enough bandwidth for more parking.

Jim Zullo, THA Consultants

Obviously, that's a decision. There are other contingencies that maybe in two years, three years as this development occurs, there can be an added level. There are those options, but one thing to remember is while nobody really knows the future of commuting to New York, I do agree the Gateway Tunnel may have an impact, that is three days a week. That commuting peak is likely given the work from home scenario. Everybody believes that we'll have a reduced computation effect at least five days a week. So, the idea is, are there other creative strategies that can be used to find commuter parking? Maybe it exists in various places around town already that the town can play a larger role in conglomerating some of those resources having more options available to commuters. This is a legitimate question that will be monitored over the next couple of years as these projects are being developed.

Mayor Brindle

For context we just received recent ridership data from New Jersey Transit and in 2019, the average weekday ridership was 2,700 boardings, in fourth quarter 2022 it is 1,10. It is well below less than half of what it was in 2019, and they're not seeing it go up exponentially, so even if ridership doubled over what it is today, it's still going to be less than one was pre-pandemic.

Jim Zullo

Just related to the garage principal, the reference to our information is not necessarily what the minimum requirement is with a parking deck, it is what the optimal is. That often relates almost to like, greenfield development, large space. It doesn't typically apply to a downtown place. I would say more than 50% and 60% of the garages and facilities that we have looked at and designed today, downtown transit oriented towns have much less efficient footprints than what was cited earlier. It's the nature of the beast to have this kind of downtown development, you don't have perfect sites, or you can build things on top of your parking facilities that would

increase the height even more. That's something that we deal with every day. When we do our parking planning, we are not dealing with optimal sites.

Mayor Brindle

Jim, someone mentioned inefficiencies with parking garages. I know there is a concerted desire for us to split the parking between North and South Side and I think the gentleman mentioned that it is creating some inefficiencies in terms of this relatively small size garage. Can you address that as well in terms of your perspective?

Jim Zullo, THA Consultants

One thing that was done around computer parking was to split the spots almost evenly. Today the predominant amount of parking comes from the South side. So, with the North facility and the South facility, you're spreading that out more evenly. If you have the most efficient site, your costs will be less per square foot. We have done garages in New Brunswick; we've done in garages in Ridgewood that had certainly less than perfect sites but they are pivotal to supporting your commuter base and facilities that are needed to provide access to mass transit that Westfield is committed to. While they are more on a cost per square foot than a very efficient facility. These are facilities that if well maintained, will last 50-60 years to support Westfield's future and those commuters. The other benefit that was mentioned is the North facility is going to provide a lot of available parking in the North District to support the downtown, late afternoons, evenings and weekends. Given my experience working in Westfield, that has always been a challenge. Also, by splitting the lots, there will be parking available for people to visit downtown in the off-peak commute hours. We have seen this in many transit-oriented downtowns. The restaurant and businesses really thrive. This North facility will be a really great asset to support some of the challenges that you've experienced in the North Side.

Councilman LoGrippe

Will you be the person to discuss the process of ingress and egress for the North Avenue facility and the approval process?

Jim Zullo, THA Consulting

That would be the traffic engineer, but we are very comfortable with the garage functionality.

John Federico, WSP Traffic Engineer

I am a professional planner and engineer with WSP, working on behalf of the town as the redevelopment traffic and circulation engineer. Specifically, regarding access and egress from that North Avenue garage; if you look at the traffic study, the majority of the primary access to that garage is North Avenue and Elm Street. During the whole process, it was crucial to look at

that intersection and rearrange it. That's why there's this new design with a four-legged intersection to make it work better because that was intended to be signalized as being the primary access point. Vehicles make all movements left, rights, throughout that location. The right in right out of North Avenue has benefits but it's serving a much smaller component of the traffic going into and out of that garage. What we determined as well that provides benefits it's not crucial to the operations of the garage. That said an application has gone into NJDOT and our initial analysis shows that this meets their conformance criteria in terms of where it's located. It's yet to be determined if they will approve it because we're working through that process. We have no indications at this point that it will not be approved by NJDOT. We will continue to work very closely with them. I want to address the issue of inconsistencies with the Master Plan as I was very involved in bringing together the Master Plan and the Unified Land Use Circulation Plan. I want to read something from the plan because we had a very nuanced discussion of congestion. Congestion is the tradeoffs and it's especially in a downtown setting in a developed town like Westfield you have to balance it and you mentioned many times in the plan multimodal access, balancing to have a community feel. An intersection with an overall level of service D or lower is generally considered as operating acceptably. All levels service E and F under the conditions that are at or above capacity, and experience excessive delays. However, it is critical to understand the limitations of using level of service as a performance metric., as an auto-oriented metric. The whole service does not fully describe the value function on the street or intersection that needs to serve multiple users, including pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users and is often at odds with community goals related to walkability placemaking in urban design. Even the highway capacity manual, which is almost like the base of traffic engineering emphasizes that level of services is only part of a bigger picture and neither level of service nor any other single performance measure tells the full story of roadway performance. Furthermore, there's broad recognition that a certain level of congestion is acceptable, particularly a vibrant transit friendly community and that congestion mitigation must be balanced with Westfield's other multimodal travel and community goals. So, when I read that, and I think about that, I do think that there is a consistency in what this plan is proposing was what was in the Master Plan.

Councilman LoGrippe

When I started on Council twelve years ago there were 25,00 cars on the Central Avenue corridor. Today, there are about 40,000 and that is only going to grow after development is in the area. What is your vision for cars to help prevent people going on Central and around the area of Clark, Boulevard, Summit. Are there any plans to widen Central Avenue?

John Federico

We're not at that point yet in terms of widening Central Avenue. Just as Councilman Contract mentioned, we've been working over the last month with Kimley Horn to do a more detailed study of the Central Avenue corridor. We're going to be looking at traffic signals along Central

Avenue down to Sycamore. We're going to be looking at how they function today with the traffic because it is a heavy traffic street. What can be done to connect those signals to make them work better? And then looking at whatever potential traffic cut through there would be on the streets. We're going to work with the town to look at the traffic calming and other up to date speed management measures on those side streets. So we've got kind of a comprehensive scope in place over the next few weeks to have a detailed look at that.

Don Sammet, Town Planner

I was involved with the 2019 Master Plan Reexamination, working with H2M and I was involved with the Unified Land Use Element of the Master Plan, and again with H2M and of course the Town has been working with Topology and the rest of the team on this Redevelopment Plan. I've also reviewed the memo from Westfield Advocates, as Chris said a lot of that deals with inconsistencies of the existing zoning. I just want everyone to understand that the Redevelopment Plan doesn't need to be consistent with existing zoning and supersede local zoning. Very often that is touted as one the benefits of redevelopment of site specific development standards apart from the existing zoning ordinances that is in a Redevelopment Plan. The Master Plan itself, does speak to greater heights design guidelines for a redevelopment project with a community formed plan. That's part of the Unified Land Use Circulation Element which provides the development framework for what is in the Redevelopment Plan. If you look at Chapter 9 of the Redevelopment Plan it goes into great detail describing that consistency with the vision statement guiding principles with the community form section for each sub area that's part of this Redevelopment Plan. That Unified Land Use and Circulation Element did a deep dive into the downtown area and established different sub areas. The Redevelopment Plan describes how it is consistent with those recommendations and the Master Plan and Unified Land Use Circulation Element and it gives further refinement of what's in that element increasing to allow building heights including the entire CBD we've talked about, greater heights and number of stories along the rail line and in redevelopment areas and once against areas that are covered by the use of design guidelines to ensure consistency with existing characters such as setbacks from upper floor, greater architectural design on mixed use development creation public spaces, public plazas, visually screening parking from your pedestrian areas, streetscape improvement recommendations, and locating offices and residential units at the Lord & Taylor site. I have looked at these documents, and I have been involved with them. I reviewed the memo that was first sent to the Planning Board and then delivered to this Council and it's my opinion that this plan is consistent with the town Master Plan, based upon the work that is being done on it, and the Planning Board adopted it and I believe to be your understanding of this well, so I thought was important to say that. I referenced not too long ago how the mayor, late great Robert Newell and myself did a YouTube video on the importance of the Master Planning process and I'm pleased to see as a Planner, these things come to fruition because very often these things sit on the shelf and gather dust. We have an implementation matrix, and our Master Plan documents, and this is helping us fulfill any of those steps that we're identifying.

Councilman LoGrippe

Can you comment on other plans you have seen such as the Waterson Lot and other lots around town?

Don Sammet, Town Planner

There's no redevelopment being done on the Waterson Lot, so I am not sure I understand the question.

Councilman LoGrippe

You have seen other plans from developers for that lot, I know the mayor has.

Don Sammet, Town Planner

There was one interested developer who came to us for Watterson. I have seen some things very much in concept.

Councilman LoGrippe

So, there are plans to go beyond this for more development?

Don Sammet, Town Planner

Well, my office receives inquiries for redevelopment interests on a constant basis. It's for properties throughout town, its single-family districts, commercial districts, whether you can subdivide a property, have an addition... etc., we run the whole gamut of course of what Westfield people are interested in doing. We did see a concept for Watterson, but it did not move forward.

Councilman LoGrippe

But the Town & the Mayor did see a plan?

Don Sammet, Town Planner

I cannot comment on the mayor but I was in a meeting with a developer who was interested in developing the Watterson Street Lot.

Mayor Brindle

Thank you, Don, and I just want to mention how hard Don and the team of professionals have worked on this project. I just want to make one comment that about the Planning Board because I think someone intimated that they didn't ask enough questions and that perhaps was a rubber stamp. This Master Plan is the Planning Board's document. It is important to understand that the people on the Planning Board are the ones that have actually been instrumental in creating and

adopting the Master Plan. So, there's no group more intimately familiar with the Master Plan than the Planning Board. I also want to acknowledge the level professionals that are our Town should be very proud that represents us on the Planning Board. We have architects, a land use attorney, three professional planners, an engineer, our Fire Chief, and Councilman Dardia and me and others. It is a highly professional group of people who do this for a living and are generous enough to volunteer service to work for the town. If they were not asking questions, it is not because they did not understand it, it is because they absolutely do understand. I just want to be very clear about that. The town should have full confidence in this group of professionals that have begun together since 2018 working on the Master Plan.

Councilwoman Habgood

I would like to thank all of the people—Ward one residents and townwide—who I have heard from in this process and who have taken the time to meet me to talk about concerns. You have been heard. Some of your feedback has already been incorporated in the RDP that is up for approval on second reading tonight, and some of it will impact and influence the next steps in the process.

I would also like to thank our tireless and dedicated Town Planner, Don Sammet as well as Topology, who have together taken on the hard work of re-imagining what empty parking lots can become in the realization of the collective goals of our residents—a vibrant downtown, a sound and viable financial future for our municipality and our schools, preservation of our history and a net benefit to our quality of life.

What I have learned in my 6 years as chair of the Finance Policy committee is that there is a lot of things we would like to do—fix sidewalks, improve intersections, build hockey rinks, install new fields, protect ourselves from future flooding, fix infrastructure, and the list goes on---but with our current tax structure we can only create very long term capital improvement plans unless we want to increase your residential taxes.....and not by a little bit....but a lot.

Fortunately, what the NJ redevelopment laws allow us as a community is to achieve all of our priorities mentioned earlier (a vibrant downtown, a sound and viable financial future for our municipality and our schools, preservation of our history and a net benefit to our quality of life without increasing taxes. By working with SWD, we can realize significant new inflows of tax revenue that enable these investments in our quality of life and protect Westfield from the impacts of future downturns.

These are the factors behind my decision:

1. The chance to work with a property owner who is already our largest downtown landowner, and one who has also successfully achieved positive net results in other places, evidencing their commitment to build something that is economically sustainable and carefully woven into our community, not creating a new one.

2. Based on the current projections, the opportunity to see a net inflow of \$140 million of PILOT monies that we as a town get to invest—new firehouse, new fields, resilient infrastructure—we get to decide together what we want, and this is on top of the infrastructure improvements that would already be ensured by the RDA.

3. The overwhelming support for this project from my constituents. I voted against the Sophia because of the concerns Councilwoman Root, and I heard from so many Ward 1 residents. This is completely different.

And so tonight, I vote yes.

Councilman LoGrippe

Linda is voting for Ward 1, but I am voting for the residents for Ward 3 and all across Westfield. The consensus of people across Westfield is they are for development. Many people like the Lord & Taylor piece of this project but the South Avenue office buildings on the lots are too large in height and scale. People are not against developing that, I think people are realizing it would be nice to see some development on the South side. There is concern about taking one of the lanes away since traffic is already present and this would create a bottleneck up to Bagel Chateau. There is too high of a volume of traffic that these buildings will create. No one who lives in Summit is going to take a train from Westfield to Newark back to Westfield so that is irrelevant with the number of people that will be commuting via train back to these buildings. The Town and Streetworks should have looked at the Central Avenue corridor coming into town like Mountain Avenue coming off of Route 22. These are all already congested areas that should have been looked at prior to this. More importantly, as far as the development piece we are giving Streetworks a no-bid contract, 30-year tax abatements for a global conglomerate. They should be paying their fair share of taxes. Councilwoman Habgood did a great job explaining additional service costs, but the developer should be paying conventional taxes. If you research PILOTs very rarely, do they reach their full potential as far as what the financials promise. I encourage everyone to look at PILOTs and the impact. Jersey City no longer allows PILOTs due to how the school systems are impacted. If the project does move forward Mayor Brindle can allocate money to the schools from the PILOT program. I think there is a lot of uncertainty at this time. Residents are frustrated by the short process. Mayor Brindle by her own omission started this process in 2018-2019. The Preview Center was opened in September near the holidays so many residents have not had the opportunity to get the details. I tell people this is happening, and people do not even know what is going on. Yes, it is on them, people should know what is going on in town. The Preview Center should have been open for another six months at least before the vote this evening. For these reasons I will be voting no on this.

Councilman Katz

I have been framing my perspective on the One Westfield place proposal through the eyes of a southside resident, not just as a councilman.

We have heard some that oppose this project tell us how this will “ruin colonial Westfield”, but I don’t believe that at all. I believe we will see an increase in our quality of life, an increase in the amount and quality of public spaces that will be within walking and safe biking distance to more of us. And all of it built on empty, ‘non-colonial’ parking lots. All of it.

For the residents of Westfield, our usage and perspective on what our town has to offer us varies based on where we live. I think the town green and the re-activated southside retail corridor will be great places for south side residents to gather, and live our lives, and it will certainly serve as an enticing gateway to the rest of our downtown.

One thing that I believe has been lost in all of the public discourse, is how absolutely stunning and cool these structures and open spaces can be. For those that have missed the design presentations, on FB live as well as in this chamber, I personally was blown away by what is to come. From the state of the art Cross Laminated Timber construction of the south side offices all the way to the reimagined Lord & Taylor building, this town will be transformed into a place that people will flock to.

From our last meeting, some words from the brave young man Sam Altman really stayed with me. He mentioned that this project was something that he and other young people saw as a reason they would also want to move back to Westfield as young adults. Although I have a daughter his same age, it wasn’t until then that I realized that this project isn’t just for the residents that live here now, or that have been here for years, but to create the Westfield of the future. I believe we have let our progress slip in the last few decades and our neighboring towns have caught up to us in many ways. This project helps bring forth a community that is not only perfect for raising families, but has housing stock for those that want to stay after emptying their nests, as well as being enticing enough to woo younger professionals back to start the cycle all over again.

I am resounding yes.

Councilwoman Root

Reasons I am supporting the Adoption of the Lord and Taylor/Train Station Redevelopment Plan.

Hello, thank you for being here on Valentine’s Day...thank you to everyone for being here from the residents to the professionals, to the Mayor and Council.

As the most recently elected council member, I’ve heard from hundreds of people, especially last year while I was campaigning door-to-door as this project was a major part of the conversation during my election.

While, yes, there are some residents expressing some reservations about some aspects of the project, much of the input I received has been positive. I ran in support of One Westfield Place,

talking to residents on a daily basis while canvassing, and meeting them at the preview center when it opened at the end of September while my opponent ran very much against the project and during our candidate's forum, she continued to express her sentiments against the project and lost the election two weeks later in our Ward 1 election by 12 points.

Secondly, I am voting for this project because HBC – Streetworks continues to be a good partner with Westfield. When they unveiled this project last year as a liaison, in September, they promised to be the listening developer and they certainly were. They have listened and made numerous changes to their project, which have been previously detailed.

I also appreciate the Greater Westfield Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown Westfield Corporation, which I sat on last year, for their support of the project. After speaking with our downtown merchants and restaurateurs, the directors of the DWC believe that One Westfield Place will be a “catalyst for growth” of our downtown businesses. Those are their words – catalyst for growth – and I think we can all agree that we all want a thriving downtown.

I am satisfied that the experts who provided us with testimony did so based on their knowledge, skill, experience, training, and education. The redevelopment plan went before our Planning Board last week as we all know and have discussed. After reviewing it, the Planning Board found that this project is aligned with our master plan. I accept their determination and that it was made in good faith.

After having spent many hours learning about the project, debating it, giving my input, I am satisfied that One Westfield Place is exactly the kind of smart development that will help revive our downtown, improve property values, help keep our property taxes stable, and positively contribute to our quality of life.

One Westfield Place will definitely change our community, but will change it for the better. We are taking a vacant building and parking lots and turning them into a thriving mixed-use, transit-oriented development that will bring people into our town to live and work, bringing new economic vitality to Westfield.

For those reasons, I am enthusiastically voting yes.

Councilman Dardia

Months ago, I was sitting downtown at one of our restaurants waiting for my wife to get off the bus. I couldn't help but hear two older couples behind me. They were talking about the proposed One Westfield Place project. Given all the sound of fury devoted to this I waited to hear their objections. They had none. They were in full support. They had apparently been to the Preview Center earlier and were excited about the ideas they heard, and they were impressed by the chance to attract new businesses to town. They were interested in the house options for them as they're getting older and didn't want to leave Westfield. They saw the renderings and they

thought it looked great. They aren't the only ones, but they aren't the loud ones. It is always easy to hear the objections about change and change is hard and we all know that. But staying stagnant as the world changes around us leaves us naive and vulnerable as other towns understand the power of thoughts and to embrace it. Towns like Morristown, which also has a strong colonial past understand this and are attracting businesses like Deloitte. They are delivering foot traffic and are hungry office workers and new businesses with them. We keep waiting for the leader store to return. For those who question the scope please understand that there's nothing gained by half measures. There's no point in committing to a little piece of the vision. There is a little less investment but far less return. For those who think the Council is blindly allegiant to Shelly, clearly you have never seen Dave eloquently speak on the Edison fields project and you forget my multiple votes against the ice rink. I think Shelly is a great leader but none of us would follow her to places we do not want to go. We have opportunities here for growth and improvement. We aren't going to be the next urban metropolis. Stop listening to the fear mongering. We aren't going to change the character of the town; it is going to be enhanced. We have gone backwards and stood still long enough. We've had months of listening, months of inviting people constructively to listen and we have taken a lot of suggestions into account. So many people have offered a lot of great and powerful ideas to make this project even better. We are extremely appreciative and clearly, we have an intelligent community with a lot of vision and knowledge. We're grateful for your input.

I think I'd be remiss if I didn't mention my own experience living downtown. Like a lot of residents, our wife and I decided to downsize when our kids finished school. We wanted to stay here in this town we love and decided to really immerse ourselves in the downtown community. We take our dogs around town for exercise, we walk through the local shops, and we visit our favorite restaurants frequently. As much as we love being down here you can recognize the need for improvements and enhance the South Avenue area with retail and restaurants, a much-needed bike lane infrastructure as well as bike amenities at the train station. A North Avenue Town Center renamed for easier drop offs and pickups and the ability to have community get together and the God awful intersection at Elm Street and North needs to be reconstructed so it is safer. These are just a sample of the benefits. There are so many more contained within the Redevelopment Plan, a plan that I along with my fellow Planning Board members last week, found to be wholly consistent with the town's Master Plan Reexamination and to that point, if there are members of the public whose intention tonight is to say otherwise. Let me make it clear, we are not here to relitigate the findings of the board, Topology and our Town Planner. We can help make this better. We need to create spaces for other residents who want to live once they no longer need the homes, or they raised their kids. We can make parking more accessible to bring in patrons and diners who don't want to troll around for spots. We can improve the sidewalks and green space and increase our restaurant options. We have everything we need to make good, better, best. We are poised for success and the time is now to bring Westfield back to the beauty and elegance that it was before and can be again if we are not afraid to act.

Councilwoman Mackey

I would like to reiterate my thanks to everybody who has spoken at these meetings and have stayed late with us. Thank you for all of the outreach, the emails, the calls, the meetings and the numerous meetings in the Preview Center, in people's homes, and various coffee shops. I appreciate the engagement and the opportunity to talk about a very complicated project. I want to reiterate tonight also that one of the reasons I and I believe some of my council members are so comfortable with this plan is that we have been a part of shaping it into a plan that we believe works for each of our wards. We've made suggestions that they've incorporated, but the plan continues to iterate, and I believe it gets better with each iteration. And I've been listening. I've been listening to everybody and no it may not always feel like there is tremendous, tremendous support for this plan. I haven't really experienced this much from any other issues since I have been on Council. And I hear the opposition, and no I don't agree with all of it, but I will absolutely continue to advocate for the best possible outcomes. I do want to talk about some inconsistencies that are regarding the character. People continue to be concerned about the character of our town by these two projects that will sit along a commercial corridor, and I want to contrast that to the work that this administration has done with regard to historic preservation/. It is really unprecedented that we have passed the historic preservation ordinance and I want to acknowledge that it is not lost on me that some of the very people who have a "No One Westfield Place" sign are the same people who said "Brindle hands off my home" when we were trying to protect the character of the neighborhoods, because that was really important to me. I moved to this town because I liked the homes and the neighborhoods, and they were coming down at a rapid pace. I'm really proud that we were able to come to a voluntary designation of nine homes at this point. I think that it's also inconsistent that when we took measures to preserve the historic kiosk at the train station that had been left to denigrate some of the same people that are opposing this plan had a problem with the allocation of funds to restore the last possible one in New Jersey. So, there were inconsistencies for sure and I just wanted to take a moment to acknowledge the work that this Council has done to preserve our neighborhoods. I also for the past five years have worked with the Downtown Westfield Corporation and have really listened to business owners and I began to understand viscerally in a very uncomfortable way, the way I have contributed to the problem that plagues them. I didn't understand at the time and every time I chose the easy way and clicked add to cart I was becoming a part of the problem. Once I realized that if I tried to train myself to really think differently about the ways I spent my money. Was it harder to go downtown? Yes, Were my costs a little bit more? Yes, but I personally think it was worth it. It was something that I actually learned by hearing the stories of the merchants. I also listened to experts on economic development and downtown revitalization, and I learned that our problems are not unique, and nor are the solutions. Doing nothing is easy. It is what has gotten us to this point. Tonight, I once again find myself faced with a decision that will impact the future of this town for decades, and I choose to invest in our future, and I vote yes to One Westfield Place.

PENDING BUSINESS

An ordinance entitled, “GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 2023-03 - AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE LORD & TAYLOR/TRAIN STATION REDEVELOPMENT PLAN.” by Councilman Contract, seconded by Councilman Dardia, was taken up, read and passed by the following vote of all present upon roll call as follows:

Yeas: Habgood	Nays: LoGrippe	Absent: Parmelee
Katz		
Mackey		
Dardia		
Root		
Mayor Brindle		

BIDS

MINUTES

On a motion by Councilwoman Mackey and seconded by Councilwoman Root, Council approved the Minutes of the Town Council Conference Session and Regular Meeting held January 31, 2023, with Councilman Contract abstaining.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

OPEN DISCUSSION BY CITIZENS

Mayor Brindle opened the public comments portion of the meeting and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Doug Miller, 619 Carleton Road - I wanted to add a few comments about commuters and parking. We all know that Westfield is a commuter town. Currently, 11% according to the town's statistics, have a household that have or are seeking a parking permit. Many more households have commuters that reach the train station by walking, bike ride, or drop-off. There is currently, according to Councilman LoGrippe, a one and a half year waiting list for parking permits. The Council released the Westfield Parking Plan that was designed to show us that the One Westfield Place development will not have an adversarial impact on the parking needs of Westfield commuters although that is not true, when one reads through the report. I want to address that in the perspective of a commuter. According to the submitted parking plan, Westfield has 624 spaces in lots 8 and the new parking plan is going to have a northside parking

garage with 248 commuter spots and it sounds like parking garages and surface that's going to have 301. That gives us 549 commuter spaces in the parking plan, which is less than what we currently have. In fact, it's only 88% of the current commuter parking. This reduced availability does not take into account the increased demand that's going to occur when new developments such as Westfield Crossing, and others are completed. One must look at the impact of these developments on commuters, on the North Side for example. We've already talked about the entrance being next to the Verizon Building. That entrance and exit for that Northside garage is about 100 feet from the intersection to North Avenue from Central. This requires a right turn from North Avenue, heading east into the garage. The exit requires a right turn from heading east into the intersection. The upshot of this, is that all morning commuter traffic on the north side needs to be funneled into North Avenue through the downtown and then backing up on North Avenue as they wait their turn to get into the parking garage. Similarly, those commuters on the way home, will be backed up leaving the garage to turn into the traffic on North Avenue that's stopped at the light at Central Avenue. With the delay in congestion from walking and parking, commuters are going to need to add at least an extra half an hour to their commuting day in the morning and evening when commuting to the city. This is going to happen to 45% of the commuters that are going to be parking in these facilities. The new office towers on South Avenue are going to have underground parking for 525 spaces for their new workers. We were told that the entrance to the new office parking will be a right turn from South Avenue heading west into the spaces. This means that everyone that's going to go into this particular parking facility is going to have to turn or go through the central South Avenue intersection. For all of the people that have been to this intersection during rush hour, already know that traffic is backed up along Central. It's almost impossible to make a left on Central from Park Street. We're going to have new office commuters that are coming, at least 525, many of which are coming from the Garden State Parkway. This congestion means that what's already happening is going to be exacerbated. What's going to happen is that there's going to be roads like Clover, Clifton, Grove, Washington and Park that are going to be exit points for all these people. This will flood the South Side neighborhoods, with commuters.

Claudia Cuca - 500 Montauk Drive - My family has lived in Westfield for 35 years. We did not move to Westfield for the downtown. We moved here because we were transferred from the Rust Belt of St. Louis to come to New Jersey for Merck. That's how we were transferred. We looked at other locations to live because Westfield, then and now, is very expensive. We came here solely for the quality of the schools. Mark, thank you for commenting on what was not going to come because I actually thought that the Lord & Taylor property would actually be paying taxes. That disturbs me. That is the only reason I'm speaking here. My kids got an excellent education. I looked at Zillow before I came in to see the ratings of the schools. The High School has an eight out of ten score and that is very high. My husband and I are considering moving just because of taxes. I am the type of person that you want to keep in town because I have no kids in

the schools, but my husband and I volunteer our time because we're both scientists and want to help the town. I mentioned eight out of ten, that's for high school. That's an excellent number. Edison School is a six out of ten, Roosevelt School is a seven out of ten. I'm very concerned about what will happen if there is less going to the schools because it's not decided what will happen to the money that will come from the PILOT program. I really want the schools to stay as excellent as they are with good teachers, excellent libraries, and additional classes of various kinds. Whatever we need to prepare our kids the next bear their iterations in line.

Sean Smith, 605 Westfield Avenue - Thank you very much for making these meetings publicly available at home. It gives people like me an opportunity to watch for a couple of hours and then come at the end when it's time for us to speak. I'm not here to talk about One Westfield Place, but as a citizen, I look forward to hearing how the Council and town plans on using those PILOT funds, to assist schools and the future of infrastructure projects. I know that over the last couple of years there was a discussion that occurred with the Board of Education that occurred in the creation of a relationship going forward. I hope that continues. I'm here about fields. Sid Fay, just so that the council is aware, because of the winter and the fact that we've had rain and not so much snow a lot of the rocks and pebbles have transferred onto Sid Fay and Houlihan. Games are starting, soccer played last night on one of the fields and those rocks can cause a safety concern for the kids playing on them but they've also caused real concerns lasting about the turf. Let's see if we can get that taken care of for the Edison field project. Let's get going. It's been four years since I've come up here. We've got it approved. Let's move that forward. And as I spoke about moving things forward, I want to see Westfield continue to be a leader in the world of safety sports things along those lines. This year represents the 10-year anniversary of Janet's law. For those of you on Council that don't know what Janet's law is, 10 years ago in 2012 the state adopted a law that requires all schools and school boards have AED's present, both in the schools and on all their facilities. It was as a result of an 11-year-old young cheerleader who passed away from cardiac arrest at an event but for some reason our legislature didn't extend it to municipalities and didn't require municipalities to be included at these other sites. Federal Grant money is available out there to get these AEDs for fields and around town. There are a lot of nonprofit organizations that will allow municipalities and assist municipalities in placing AEDs on each of our fields. And everybody listening knows about our recent Buffalo Bills safety who nearly dropped dead but didn't happen to suffer from severe cardiac arrest in the fields. I think it's time for the town to revisit this issue. I know it was before the Council probably 15 years ago. It was a concern at that point in time about liability to the Town. Times have changed in New Jersey. Schools are required to have the AEDs on their fields in a marked box. Let's be a leader. Let's obtain those AEDs for our children and our adult participants.

Steven Goodman, 322 Orenda Circle - I have met with several members of the Council to discuss the One Westfield Place project. Just a few steps from where we sit is perhaps one of the most wonderful parts of Westfield, Mindowaskin Park. The place is special. What makes it special are the winding walkways, bridges, a beautiful lake, a large lawn with a gazebo, delightful older trees, fountains, geese and ducks, and the ability to sit on one of the benches to eat lunch or have some ice cream. There are no giant structures here to obstruct your view. This is Westfield. Sometimes you have to look more at what you have and not what you want. I know I'm not alone in loving this park as I walk here often. Many non-residents come here at all times of the year to get married, take wedding pictures or have small ceremonies. What makes this place attractive to everybody is its ambience, its charm, its walkability, its visibility and its convenience. You just have to walk a few steps and you are on Broad Street, it's so simple. As we know there is a Master Plan to keep Westfield current with the times. The administration attests that the town is in decline and in need of a reservation. Businesses are closing and we need to add more businesses and apartments to keep those other businesses afloat and prevent them from closing. Let me remind you that all businesses go through ebbs and flows. If you haven't owned or run a business in your life you won't know that. I hope that some of you at some point in your life had a visit for lunch or dinner at the Boathouse in Central Park. This was a wonderful difficult to get a reservation, restaurant and a beautiful park standing right on the lake. It was open for 50 years and closed its doors forever this October. It wasn't a transportation issue. It wasn't a reservation issue. It wasn't that it lacked visitors. Like other businesses in New York and even Westfield and other towns, crap just happens. You can't always predict or prevent rises or falls. The thought that you could completely change the future of the city by changing the parameters, the topography, the building heights or adding small town dreams by adding large parking structures and increasing enormously the size and scope of office space in town is illogical. The "walking wallets" of the new businesses, that is if they fill up the vacant office spaces will at 5:00P.M. run not walk home. They have family and other obligations more important than to spend most of their evenings supporting Westfield. Lunch will most likely be inside or a short walk from the local office location and again for convenience. In the Master Plan I question why build all of these structures is bigger, better and for who? Are more offices better, and for who? Are new offices better, and for who? Office space is universal in today's times. Can you talk about security in the Master Plan? I've asked several times where's the new firehouse? How do emergency vehicles get access into the North Avenue train station, especially around cars waiting for pickups or Ubers and cars trying to get out of the garage? The Fire Chief was on the dais at the Planning Board meeting last week and made no mention as to the location of the firehouse, but I have asked countless times. I came for a different answer, but I was hoping that there'd be an understanding that some of the populace would be accommodated by some changes in the direction of the Councilman. I asked now that once this has passed, you hear some of these people loud and clear and it's not just them, numerous people have wisdom themselves. Listen to what we have to say and incorporate that into your plans. I'd like you to bring down the height of some of these buildings and make some accommodations.

Rob Galgano, 939 Boulevard - I wanted to talk about the atmosphere of this project. I am in favor of One Westfield Place, and I am glad you passed the Redevelopment Plan. The group who is against this and had a lot of problems regarding consistency have three subgroups. There are people who have genuine concerns about the project or small aspects of the project and that is reasonable. There are also people who oppose the entire plan or most of it and still would complain about traffic and parking without realizing that this entire plan holistically is meant to solve those problems such as, traffic, flow, and other parking issues. These people were a little meaner. I know that people like me who support the project, I would be accused of being a sheep or a minion and we do not appreciate that. I find that the very vocal group was very extreme. I found they didn't want any development at all, and it would result in online intimidation, like saying this is our town not yours or you need to be gone and gone soon. Some of you have been accused of corruption and self-dealing. You know, that's just not true. Personally, I found that very bothersome. I think the clowning around out in the world needs to stop. It is done, it has passed, and I am very happy about it. I just think that the opposition did not have a compelling set of reasons. They tried, but they didn't convince anyone to vote the other way on the Planning Board or with yourselves. I was going to make comments about this poll, but it is kind of irrelevant now. But as you know, they couldn't muster 840 theoretically valid votes in a community with 30,000 residents. It was the simplest form of civic engagement possible. Fill out a short form on a computer screen and yet they couldn't convince 900 people to do that, despite a highly visible online campaign. Anyone paying close attention to the process would know the areas in questions were declared an area in need of redevelopment beginning September of 2019. An article regarding the Lord & Taylor property on patch.com from May of 2020 quoted the mayor stating HBC could move forward but as of right development and retention that may not be in the community's best interest. So, I ask that you stay informed, engaged and open minded as the redevelopment process moves forward. You see, in the end, it's all been done in secret behind your back in an out in the open in front of your face kind of way. Simply put, I think this is a town government run by people who know what they're doing. This has all been in the works for years. I do not think anyone should fault you for using the tools available to implement the town's Master Plan. We've been waiting decades to move forward as other towns do.

Michael Armento, 30 Sandra Circle - I would like to thank Councilman LoGrippo for being the sole voice of reason on the Town Council. I was hoping to stand before you to implore you to put a pause in the redevelopment project, but obviously that is moot now. A non-binding referendum was requested by residents, and we were told it is not possible due to an interpretation of law to satisfy your own agenda which is a discussion for another time. However, the Town Council did have the ability to pause this project which would allow for more time for this to be discussed, further reviewed and assessed. However, you decided not to do that either. You are beholden to Streetworks rather than your constituents. Streetworks does not care about Westfield, they care

about only one thing, making money. If you do not realize that you should not be leading our town. As you've heard, there are many inconsistencies with the UCLC, and the Town Council has ignored it and actually belittled the findings. It is very well documented. The town survey indicated citizens do not want to change the charm and look of the town. They did not want to increase the heights of the buildings that the Master Plan calls for including the increase over 50ft and redevelopment planning in the case 65-75 ft including five extra ft for machinery on top of the buildings. From the start the planning goes against the wishes of the residents who filled out the survey commissioned by you and there was only about 800 people in that survey and that was commissioned by the town. You have other surveys and petitions with much more numbers. There are over 2,200 signatures on a petition asking you to put a pause on this project. This is not a few vocal people. This is a petition that was done in 60 days and had more signatures than participants for the Master Plan. In addition, TapInto Westfield conducted a poll with over 1,000 people against the project and 300 for it. Anecdotally speaking, I don't like speaking and anecdotes but since the mayor has mentioned that "a lot of people have emailed me in support of this project" we may consider using the open public records act to review the emails to see if there's substance behind these comments. I would like to give two anecdotes, last week I came to the town Planning Board meeting. I walked into the meeting with a woman I just met at the door. She told me she just moved to Westfield from New York. I asked her if she was for or against this project, she looked at me and said this project is crazy. She laughed at the comparison to Bryant Park. The park is in the center of one of the biggest cities in the world. Another person I was talking to was neutral on the project. His reasoning was that he doesn't really go into Westfield much because of all the traffic and poor parking. Both of these are going to get worse based on the numbers provided by Streetworks. Another area that goes against the town survey results, which is improved parking, but in reality, it's not no matter how you twist the numbers. The project will definitely change the face and charm of Westfield with large buildings, increased traffic and less parking. People who oppose the opposition indicate the votes in the previous elections indicated the town was for this however that is not true. People who voted for you and supported you are against this. We're not against redevelopment, but overdevelopment. This plan came out in September. There's only a short time between one election for one council seat. Not to mention that a lot of the planning occurred during the pandemic when people were concerned about living and dying and not redevelopment. Presently there's litigation in Westfield over the Sophia project, I also recently read the citizens of Scotch Plains were suing Westfield over the cell tower and the Mayor of Scotch Plains may soon join them. Not only are you angering the town's people, but you are also angering the adjacent town's people. Based on the outcome of the vote tonight, you'll be now facing more litigation. Based on our recommendations; the recommendations could have solved this problem simply by taking a pause and reassessing this project. We hope you have made proper decisions based on all the information that's been provided. Unfortunately, you did not and there is recourse for politicians who take up their own agendas at the expense of their constituents, including the mayor and possibly Town Council members. If 850 signed a survey and got only eight registered voters to

each sign the recall petition there certainly would be enough signatures to initiate a recall for Mayor. Mayor Brindle, your legacy may be the first female Mayor Westfield, it may be this insane redevelopment project or maybe it should be the first female Mayor of Westfield to be recalled. You stated that the people opposed to this project are a small vocal minority, but actually we are a large silent majority. Your last election you won with less than 8,000 votes, a recall petition with 6,400 votes will be a large first step of changing the leadership of this Town.

Bob McNammera, 603 Lawrence Avenue - I would have hoped that members of the Council would have appreciated the speakers who opposed segments of the Redevelopment Plan who did so with good intentions. I want to address Councilman Dardia in particular and his comments about fear mongering. You should be ashamed of yourself. That was really uncalled for. All of us who spoke on the issue spent hours reviewing the Redevelopment Plan and came to you with reasonable modifications to the plan. There was no one who said leave the status quo. Nobody said do nothing. But you said that's what we said. Again, your comments were unprofessional and divisive.

Greg Kasko, 434 Everson Place - 51 year resident and I would like to pay homage to Chad Kroger and JT Parr, two Laguna Beach, Town Council icons, so with that I say what up Council and I'm stoked to be here tonight. When I said I've been a resident for 51 years and no way is that to diminish any other residents who've lived here for a shorter period of time. It is to emphasize the fact that I've watched how Westfield has changed over the last five decades and is in desperate need of redevelopment. Westfield redevelopment is long overdue. I thank you, those of you that have come out to these Town Council meetings in opposition against One Westfield Place. That includes some of my neighbors and actually a Westfield high school classmate of mine that was here tonight that I got a chance to speak to. I want to thank all of those who have come here in support of One Westfield Place. Can remember meetings in the early 2000s and through 2010 that were attended by maybe a dozen people sitting in this chamber; nobody cared or felt important enough to attend meetings. It seemed like the Town Council was on cruise control. Thank you to the Town Council for following through with what many of you campaigned on taking the necessary steps to revitalize our downtown by moving forward with this plan. Hindsight being 2020 if we go back to the fall of 2017 this Mayor campaigned on doing something to revitalize this downtown. Mayor Brindle when you ran again in 2021, your opposition used the downtown's vacancies against you. vacancies that existed before your first campaign for office in 2017. Now trying to do something about downtown, this is being used against you. Now you're being accused of overdevelopment by actually doing something like you said you would do. Development that was proposed back in 1999. And for that I commend you. You're embarking on a plan that past administrations have passed the buck on, kicked the can down the road, turned a blind eye to. Westfield became complacent after 1999, the

Downtown Westfield Improvement Plan was presented. That shows exactly what we see being proposed and passed now. Anyone can Google Westfield Downtown Improvement Plan in 1999 and it's all right there and it's on the town's website. This is how the government works. Checks and balances, debates, Town Council meetings, free public speech or free speech during public comment, disagreements, agreements are a democracy despite the fact that there are those that do not agree and that's okay. In all my years of attending Town Council meetings, witnessing projects that passed without much public outreach, I can attest to the fact that One Westfield Place has been the most vetted projects from a public input point of view. That includes a Preview Center, Town Council presentations, public outreach by the Town Council surveys, email correspondence and much more, including social media outreach and debate. These are all examples. Colonial Westfield is the Miller Cory house. I first visited the Miller Cory House on a field trip in 1972 as a second grader at Franklin school. Westfield was settled in 1664. We were known as the west field to Elizabethtown. That's how we got our name. This is Westfield 2023 and Westfield will continue to transform. We have to. Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. But most importantly thank you Mayor Brindle for following through with probably the most important campaign promise made by any Westfield elected official in the last twenty years and that is doing something to revitalize the town we all love.

Tony LaPorta, 409 North Chestnut Street - First I want to recognize Councilman LoGrippe. He is a Republican, I'm a Democrat. I was the first Democrat elected on the North side of town, in the town's history. Councilman LoGrippe was just honored by his party for being Union County Councilman of the year. We are a small town, we're all friends, neighbors, and I think it would be fitting if you were to give Councilman LoGrippe some kind of citation that he was honored by as party for Councilman of the year. I congratulate the members of the Town Council that were in favor of this plan though I'm totally against it, for your victory. Now, you may think you won; you may think the game's over but this is the first inning. This is the top of the first inning. The people that have been against this plan, the two groups that formed the advocates and residents haven't been up to bat yet, they are going to get up to bat soon. I believe there's going to be some major changes in this, if it goes forward at all. One thing that really bothers me is the position the Town Council and Town Attorney has taken on the legality of the referendum. I challenge you to have the referendum in November. So, you say why would you? Why would you want a referendum? We just passed it. The non-binding referendum is a public question. That's really what it is, a public question. Has no force of law. I've heard you say up here that you've received phone calls and emails, congratulations, people stopping and yelling in the street and supermarket they're all in favor of it. Okay, so let's look at it. TapInto Westfield runs a survey, 70% of the people vote against this, 70%. Look at the people that are against this plan. Many of them were former supporters of yours and friends of yours, you have to really think about this. It is easy to say everyone is in favor of this, so prove it. I challenge you to have the non-binding referendum in November as a public question. Then it comes down to the legality of

it. The Town Attorney has said we will be sued. Sued by who? By the developer? The person we're supposed to trust, they're going to sue us for something that's totally legal. I would bet big money that would never happen. It is the Town Attorney's job to advise the Town Council and I think he's done a poor job. Again, I will cite the document that you have from New Jersey Appleseed, a pro bono law firm. I went to them and asked them about this. They didn't do it for the money, they are a pro bono law firm. Question, does the explicit prohibition in local government housing law against a citizen's statutory right of initiative a referendum regarding matters, subjects that law reached public questions placed on the ballot by the municipality for a non-binding advisory vote? Answer - No the New Jersey Supreme Court has explicitly held prohibition found in Municipal Land Use Law against the voters right to repeal a zoning ordinance does not apply to non-binding votes for question placed by a municipality on the ballot pursuant to N.J.S.A 19:37-1. Great Atlantic Pacific Tea Company v. Mayor and Council of Borough of Point Pleasant. She goes on to say it is because of New Jersey Appleseeds expertise in this matter that I understand that you, meaning a member of two community-based organizations Westfield Advocates and Residents for Westfield have asked for our opinion about the question stated above.

Rob Dalgilesh, 825 Prospect Street - I feel like people raised some important and addressable issues in opposition to this plan. I understand the desire to get to yes and no plan is perfect, and we can't just do nothing. I don't see why voting for a flawed plan or staying stagnant is our only choice. This is a false choice. So, I wouldn't ask you to do nothing. I'd actually ask you to do more and work on the plan presented with addressing some of these issues is better.

Susan Goodman, 322 Orenda Circle - So to continue where I left off, if you don't know me by now you will because I'm going to be here every two weeks over the next three years. I see a lot of procedural and social injustice here. Let's start with Sophia, Edison School turf fields, the cell tower, those poor Scotch Plains residents. How would you like to have a cell tower on the other side of the fence, and now this. You all live in nice neighborhoods. You don't live on North Avenue, on Clark Street towards the YMCA, you don't live on Charles Street, you don't live on the edge of Boulevard and Summit that's close to town. None of you live close to town except for you (Councilman Dardia) and you sold your property so maybe you're getting ready to move on.

Councilman Dardia

I would like to just say that I live in the center of town at 1 Lincoln Plaza.

Susan Goodman continued comments - you can all say that you live in beautiful neighborhoods but those poor people that I talked to that are close to the center of town are all afraid of what's

going to happen. I know there are people that are for it, but you're so self-assured that this is wonderful. I'm going to continue to go to every ward and I'm going to go door to door and we're going to see how many people really love it. Young people as well as old people are not afraid of change. They're afraid of the vastness of this project. They're afraid of the financials of this project. They're afraid it's going to change downtown so drastically. They're afraid that we're never going to be able to fill the storefronts and the retail areas. It goes on and on and on. I've been to over 200 houses and 80% are not for your project so I don't know who you're talking to. I am going to continue if you're so self-assured, I will continue to go from door to door. I present myself as a longtime resident and I would like to know what you think of One Westfield Place plans as they presently are. Occasionally I get somebody that says I love it, I said great. Thank you for answering the door, have a good day and smile. I don't try to convince them any differently. But what do I get in this project? What project, or yeah, I'm really confused. I'm not quite sure. What are we getting? What's happening? What's going on? I don't like it. I'd like some aspects of it, but I don't want the height of it. I don't want to get rid of my parking lots. I don't want to sell property downtown. I don't really think I like this PILOT project. I don't like finance. One gentleman said my wife loves Mayor Brindle, but I'm going to sign your petition because this is just not right. So don't be afraid you're really confident. I'm going to continue going from door to door because these residents need to know what they are getting. Many of them don't know what they're getting. They're too busy or they're afraid to come up here. They think you're intimidating. They don't feel comfortable talking to you. They don't feel comfortable going downtown. They're busy just trying to get through life. And what I'm afraid of is four to seven years from now when you're probably not going to be an office anymore. These people are going to drive up and down North and South Avenue and say oh my god, what the hell happened here. I didn't sign up for this. I came to be in a suburban town. If you like Manhattan so much, you'd like to shop where you work, just go back and live there. Don't screw my town.

Frank Fusaro, 422 Stanley Avenue - Topology once again did not address the loss of commuter parking and the lack of any additional shopper parking, which we have needed for the past 30 years. We do not need the night and weekend parking, no one shops at our downtown stores at night because simply they're closed. As I mentioned at previous meetings, trains to New York City depart from the South side. So why are we constructing a parking garage on the North side, which is 33% larger than the one on the South side. Not to mention the ingress and egress nightmare at the North side which will never be approved by the New Jersey Department of Transportation. I'd also like to point out several Council members have said in response to emails from their constituents, while referring to the opposition Councilwoman Habgood calls out the "few who oppose" as well as "a small but loud minority". Over 2,000 people are not considered a few who oppose or a small loud minority. Where's your majority? Why have we not heard from this majority? The opposition has provided testimony from concerned architects, planners, engineers, real estate executives and traffic experts which have all been ignored. In the last Town

Council meeting over 30 residents spoke in opposition to this development, yet only 12 spoke to support it. Is that the majority you're calling for? I just don't see the majority here. It appears and by the way, you keep saying that you want people to come up and speak. All the testimony that's given at these meetings is considered necessary or relevant I should say. I just don't see the supporters showing up in support in mass numbers with this project as you've stated. It appears the Town Council is taking a page from the national political playbook. In that any information that is presented which does not agree with your belief, it is simply called out as fake news or misinformation. The facts have been presented by numerous opponents is not fake news and should not be labeled for such simply because you disagree with. By rushing through your vote tonight, on Valentine's Day you have done a gross injustice to our town.

Jim Boyes, 122 Ferris Place - Tonight you're going to be voting on an Ordinance to amend the Town's Vacant and Abandoned Property Ordinance. I'm just curious how many developers or property owners have actually self-reported under that ordinance today? Because it doesn't really make much sense to have an ordinance that requires the offending party to report on themselves. If there's been no registrations in that regard in the past few years, rather than having our Town Attorney spend time amending an ordinance that's not being enforced to any degree. We just say scrap it. If anyone has those stats on the number of properties, either abandoned or vacant, self-registry I'd be interested in it.

David Vecca, 222 Midwood Place - I want to say congratulations. I am really happy to see it move forward. I think it'd be great for the town. I was thrilled to listen to the professionals respond to a number of inquiries today that people are saying they didn't respond to. I would also add to the Westfield Advocates and all the other groups, I would love to talk to you more about this because I don't understand the anger and indignation over it. I know you feel very strongly, but it's a building and I don't can't wrap my head around the anger you're bringing to the issue. It is a building; it's not going to ruin the town. I would like to know more. Thank you, Council, for representing the town and doing all that you do.

Carla Bonacci, 603 Lawrence Avenue - I'm glad you're all still paying attention. Westfield Advocates and Residents for Westfield work together. We have a concern over responsible development. What we've always asked for is that you try to build consensus and that you compromise. Yes, no plan is perfect, but the first plan is definitely never perfect. Now I have worked for the last 22 years on the most complicated projects in this country. What I don't see here, what I saw there is compromise, consensus, caring, is inclusivity, you've done none of that. You try to belittle us. We have a petition. All we have to listen to is you are not satisfied with the numbers. TapInto tried to appeal to people to request the polls and then they got belittled. People

are concerned with the size and the scale of this project, the financials and the long term and the length of time in the middle of an active community and a lot of us have actually done these projects for our career. We know the pitfalls and we have tried to share with you, but we don't get any responsiveness and that's why there's anger. We walked door to door, I've done it. When I hear what people say, it makes it closer to home. It gives me real facts that we understand where people are coming from. I don't think any one of you set up coffees in your constituencies to explain to them the plan, other than what you did with the Sophia and then people were mad, and you got upset. When you talk to people you have to listen, and you have to make changes as you can see here. Your plan is not perfect. We don't want to look like every other town. We can go from Roselle to Plainfield with a beautiful board with all of the projects that are being built. And guess what? The most projects have been built with apartments is Westfield. I guess you're doing a great thing because you want to catch up with the Joneses. And now you're surpassing them, but with something that really will not be nice. You don't have to believe me, but I know what I'm talking about, so do a lot of other people. We really just wanted you to listen, Shelley and go back to the developer and make adjustments. They do it all the time. That's what developers do but you have to talk to them and make changes. We hope that you will, but we figured you're not going to, and we will deal accordingly. We are not going away. We're here to stay. We are going to be watching and holding you all accountable.

Liz Mullholand, 1029 Harding Street - I came up here to speak about educational funding because I've heard that there was a question. The last speaker was so absolutely arrogant and disrespectful, I just have to tell you as a resident here, that kind of toxicity is exactly what we don't need here. I am very frustrated that there has to be this hatred and anger simply because they don't like a project. It's not necessary. It's a small community. We all know each other. It's just completely unacceptable. I apologize on behalf of the community for the way you've been spoken to. So, it's disgraceful. You guys have been meeting several times with the residents. Numerous online discussions and Facebook Lives. Residents can meet with the Mayor & Council and visit the Preview Center. This is just atrocious behavior. What I wanted to speak about was about public education funding. I am a Public-School Advocate and I work with legislators at the State house to try to protect public schools and work on funding. I also have a master's degree in Education. I have been in the field for over 30 years. PILOTs do not impact public school funding. The public schools will always be fully funded. I also wanted to say great news because I heard that there was a little concern about our rankings, we have two Blue Ribbon schools in our district. As we know we have top rated schools, we always have. Another piece of information, Blue Ribbon schools are forever, once you are designated it is lifetime. I just wanted to clarify that our schools will always be fully funded PILOT or no PILOT.

Seeing no further comments, Mayor Brindle closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mayor Brindle

Thank you, Mrs. Mullholland, for addressing the public school funding. There are two things I would like to reiterate what Mrs. Mullholland said. PILOTs have no impact on schools, they are always fully funded. That is always important to remember. The schools get paid first out of the tax dollars. You do not need to worry about schools losing funding. One of the things that we are trying to solve is to be able to provide new revenue streams to stabilize and potentially lower taxes over time. So, residents like Mrs. Cuca do not have to make a decision to move out of town. So, schools are always fully funded irrespective of a PILOT and we have an opportunity to make Westfield more affordable for people who might otherwise consider leaving.

Councilwoman Habgood

Mayor, I think it is important to understand that even though the developer here would not be paying conventional taxes, they are paying a payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT) and the monies that come to the municipality are greater than a percentage of taxes that would come to the municipality under conventional taxes. The municipality now has more money as I mentioned earlier, to cover a whole bunch of items that are on our wish list for improvements, including things that we can do to help the schools. We are not planning to make an upfront commitment to the schools because the PILOT is a 30-year agreement and there's no way for us to know what the schools might need in that timeframe. We made a commitment to begin to work with the schools to help them with the things that they have in the capital improvement category that they would not need to be able to cover on their own. A perfect example of that is the Edison Fields project where we've been working very closely with the schools to help improve the fields.

Councilman LoGrippe

I would like to just add Mayor, what Liz Mullholland said is true the schools will always be fully funded. With PILOTs the difference is where that money comes from. It's broken down into conventional taxes. If these PILOTs do not reach the revenue projections, then it is going to be up to all of us to make up the difference. That is the difference with PILOTs. Conventional taxes the money is guaranteed. PILOT programs are based on projections. If you look at the history of PILOTs in New Jersey, they don't reach the projections. In 25 years, no one is going to go back to 2023 and say Westfield didn't make their projections based on the PILOT we are offering. Mrs. Goodman, if you would like to walk with me in Ward 3, I would be happy to walk with you.

Councilman Contract

Mark, I think it is important to understand that if this project does not get built you are talking about future revenues that will never happen. It is important to understand that this project will still pay conventional taxes on the land the PILOT is only on the improvements. If anything with

the Town selling the land, there will be more conventional taxes generated than current because the town will be selling municipal parking lots that currently do not generate any taxes. So, your raising a fear about future revenues that will never happen if the PILOT doesn't go through. You know that and you are purposely fear mongering.

Councilman LoGrippe

David, how much does Lord & Taylor pay in taxes today?

Councilman Contract

Lord & Taylor pays approximately \$550,000.00.

Councilman LoGrippe

So that \$550,000.00 is coming off the conventional tax roll. The land piece of all of this is only \$73,000.00, so do not give this exorbitant number on the land piece.

Mayor Brindle

What comes on the tax rolls are parking lots. What comes off the tax rolls is about \$120,000.00 net. What comes into us is about \$4.5 million. You can argue that the \$120,000.00 is coming off the tax rolls but \$4.5 million is coming in via the PILOT. Mrs. Goodman, just for the record of who lives where, I live right off of North Avenue, right at the intersection of South Euclid and North Avenue where all that new development is happening currently. I am absolutely impacted and affected by all that. When you make the claim that none of us live in the area, I live in probably one of the most affected areas. I welcome the investment of North Avenue. It is a significant improvement over the blight that exists there today. I also want to mention those that mentioned all of the apartments that are being built. The majority of those apartments are part of our affordable housing settlement that was approved by previous administrations. I would say that of the 800 mentioned, there are at least 500 from the housing agreement that we inherited. I love the fact that we are a proud COAH town, and we are leading the way to drive our affordable housing. I'm very proud of that, especially when school enrollment has been declining. I think it is a great thing for our community. I know there is a lot of discussion on the petition and I apologize if there's a sense that we are diminishing it because that's not an intention at all. But I can tell you from where I sit as Mayor and all the Mayors I've talked to that are in the big group of bipartisan Mayors. It is a well-known fact that just 21% of people oppose anything you do. So when you say you received 2,200 signatures, which represents less than 10% of our population. I am telling you 1,100 of those were done before January 3rd., and majority of those were done within the first three weeks of that petition being out, before information was even available. I have an opportunity and obligation to explain and you mentioned fear mongering. I will tell you what fear mongering is in my mind, and out of respect for Councilman Dardia, fear mongering is sending out false information. Putting flyers on windshields telling people that their South Avenue parking is going away. Fear mongering is telling everybody they are going to be living

in Hoboken and Jersey City, which is absurd. Fear mongering is telling people there is going to be nowhere to park, and by the way, the night and weekend parking will be great for people when they visit restaurants downtown. So I have to say while we appreciate the efforts of the petition, it does not represent a significant majority and it is in spite of your own admission and my friends who have seen you at their doors. In spite of going door to door and handing out flyers. I have copies of the emails to give you examples which is why I am not surprised when you go door to door people say no One Westfield Place because people are uninformed. Here is an email from somebody saying “this is why I am opposed to One Westfield Place; the new parking facilities will require residents to pay for parking on weekdays and weekends regardless of the hour”. Not true. “The train commuters will have to add extra time to their commute”. I am sorry, that notion about the garage is going to add twenty minutes, who made that up? Are there facts based on that estimate? I can tell you as a former commuter, the location of the South Avenue garage proximity to the platform where commuters can be undercover the entire time is way more preferable than seeing cars on the far side of South Avenue parking lot in the rain. If you are someone that had to park on the far end of the South side, and now you're coming to the North side, being in the North side garage is a benefit. So this notion that twenty minutes is going to be added is not a fact. It's based upon conjecture. Also, this notion that parking garages are not safe is ridiculous. Majority of towns along the rail line have garages. All these people in Summit, Millburn, Metuchen, Ridgewood, Cranford, are afraid to park in the garages? That is not what I am hearing from anybody. It is a lot of conjecture and is not based upon facts. While I respect the petition, I have to say it does not represent a majority of our community.

Councilwoman Mackey

I wanted to address Mrs. Goodman who said she did not think any of us have met with our constituents. I think that's a disservice to everybody on this dais who have held multiple sessions at the Preview Center, and in people's living rooms, in coffee houses, nights and weekends. We invest a significant amount of time and while the room is cleared out now, people in this room that I personally have met with more than once. So, you may dislike the conclusions we have come to, but please do not disparage the time we have taken away from our families to meet with any person who has wanted to meet us. I do not think that any one of us denied the opportunity for a phone call or a meeting.

Councilman LoGrippe

There is a school election in April. There is still time to put this on the ballot. If you feel confident that this is the direction of what the town wants. Why don't we just put this on the ballot in April.

Town Attorney

Not only is a non-binding referendum illegal but if it were in some way legal, I could not be put on the April school board ballot because the requirement of the non-binding referendum law N.J.S.A. 19:37-1, requires that it be put on the next ensuing general election, that's the language. The next general election is in November so it couldn't be on the April ballot. Also, the question that was asked to NJ Appleseed in relation to a referendum was a question about the Municipal Land Use Law and its statutory prohibition against referendum. But the question asked didn't pose the question in the sense of the redevelopment law. The redevelopment statute has a different referendum section with a different referendum language. That language specifically says that notwithstanding any other provision of law, there can be no referendum. And that notwithstanding language, means that notwithstanding what exists in any other statute, in the state of New Jersey codebook, including the non-binding referendum law. The question wasn't asked correctly to NJ Appleseed, in fact, the case that was cited which is correct to cite under the Municipal Land Use Law, but that case didn't involve a redevelopment project, and it didn't involve the question of the redevelopment law.

Councilman LoGrippe

If we really wanted to, we could vote on this and put it on a ballot.

Town Attorney

I wouldn't counsel you to do that because it would be unlawful.

Councilwoman Habgood

Thank you for addressing that. I also want to add that we have known for a long time that it wouldn't be advisable for us to go to referendum on this whether it was lawful or not. That is the whole reason why we have been so public and open about this process, because we've been inviting you to give feedback that we've been taking into account and has been incorporated into the plan. I think it is important to note that we are not hiding behind a legal opinion or the legality of a non-binding referendum.

Town Attorney

I also wanted to address Mr. Boyes question with respect to the vacant and abandoned modifications that are being done here tonight. As the Council heard in the conference session as well as the Code Review Committee, discussed at great length changes that are being made to our vacant and abandoned ordinance are being made as a result of certain significant changes to state law, particularly with respect to foreclosure action. So, the state in 2020 changed the foreclosure laws to require that creditors who initiate foreclosure proceedings on commercial properties, notify municipalities that the properties are in foreclosure and to provide the municipal Clerk with the listing of all commercial properties in the municipality in which foreclosure actions are currently pending. What municipalities of course find is that its properties in foreclosure and that are bank owned are the ones that are the most difficult. If I could put it

that way from a property maintenance perspective. And so, the state law requires banks or foreclosure entities to notify municipalities of that fact. We have a vacant and abandoned registration ordinance which we use as another tool. We have a property maintenance code ordinance that we use as a tool. I do not want there to be a misunderstanding that there is a requirement that people or property owners in this town who own a defined vacant property be registered with the town. If they don't do that they can be fined and penalized for doing so. So, this is a tool by the municipality to make sure that if there is a property that is in bad shape, if it is vacant, if it is abandoned, if it's dangerous, and this is a health safety and welfare ordinance that we know about. We know who the owners are, and it's on our list so that we can go to them if there's a problem, oftentimes maintenance or if there's a health and safety problem. To answer the specific question, we've had six self-reporters, registered with the Town Clerk and currently have three. As a result of this ordinance change and in particular, as a result of the change in state law, we will have many more registered vacant and abandoned properties.

Town Administrator

I wanted to address Mr. Smith's comment. We do have AEDs at all our fields. We did that many years ago as well as our buildings, right outside this room is an AED on the wall.

BILLS AND CLAIMS

On motion by Councilwoman Habgood, seconded by Councilwoman Root bills and claims were adopted unanimously:

RESOLVED that the bills and claims in the amount of \$607,764.30 per the list submitted to the members of this Council by the Chief Financial Officer, and approved for payment by the Town Administrator be, and the same are hereby, approved and that payroll warrants previously issued by the Chief Financial Officer be ratified.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

Finance Policy Committee

The following resolutions, introduced by Councilwoman Habgood, seconded by Councilman Dardia, were unanimously adopted.

Resolution No. 57

RESOLVED that the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to draw a warrant in the amount of \$654.00 to the order of New Jersey Department of Health, P.O. Box 369, Trenton, New Jersey for Dog Licenses issued by the Town Clerk for the month of January 2023.

Resolution No. 58

RESOLVED, that the Town Treasurer be authorized to refund the following fees to the following individual via credit card:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Fee</u>
Ankur Patel	Withdrew	Me & My Gal Dance Saira Patel	\$70.00 Credit Card
Monika Desai	Duplicate Registration	Me & My Gal Dance Rajen & Ava	\$140.00 Credit Card

Resolution No. 59

RESOLVED that the Chief Financial Officer is hereby authorized to issue warrants noted below to the order of the Downtown Westfield Corporation, for Special Improvement District Taxes as provided in the year 2023 budget:

February 14, 2023, \$104,086.75

May 9, 2023, \$104,086.75

Resolution No. 60

RESOLVED that the Chief Financial Officer is hereby authorized to issue warrants noted below to the order of the County of Union, for County Purpose and Open Space Taxes and Added and Omitted County and Open Space Taxes as provided in the year 2023 budget:

County Purpose Taxes
February 15, 2023, \$9,442,414.88

May 15, 2023, \$9,442,414.89

County Open Space Taxes
February 15, 2023, \$323,177.13

May 15, 2023, \$323,177.12

County Added & Omitted Taxes
February 15, 2023 \$197,435.76

County Open Space Added & Omitted Taxes
February 15, 2023 \$6,557.64

The following resolution, introduced by Councilwoman Habgood, seconded by Councilwoman Mackey was adopted by the following roll call vote:

Resolution No. 61

RESOLVED that the Chief Financial Officer be authorized to make the following transfer(s) in the 2022 Budget (Appropriation Reserve) accounts, where (S&W) refers to the Salary & Wages line item while (O/E) refers to the Other Expenses line items:

	<u>OUT</u>	<u>IN</u>
<u>CURRENT FUND</u>		
Administrative & Executive 2-01-100-210 (O/E)	\$1,500	
Finance Department 2-01-115-213 (O&E)	1,500	
Fire Department 2-01-125-101 (S&W)	2,000	
Parking Administration 2-01-131-101 (S&W)	500	
Board of Health 2-01-150-2214 (O/E)		\$6,200
Public Works 2-01-137-101 (S&W)	2,000	
Recreation 2-01-155-101 (S&W)	700	
Public Buildings & Grounds 2-01-185-214 (O/E)		2,000
	<hr/> \$8,200	<hr/> \$8,200

Yeas: Habgood Nays: Absent: Parmelee
 LoGrippo
 Katz
 Mackey
 Contract
 Dardia
 Root
 Mayor Brindle

Code Review & Town Property Committee

General Ordinance No. 2023-04

Regarding the following ordinance, Councilman Contract made the following announcement:

I hereby move that an ordinance entitled, “GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 2023-04 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE TOWN CODE AS IT RELATES TO VACANT AND/OR ABANDONED PROPERTIES”

The motion was seconded by Councilman Contract.

General Ordinance No. 2023-04 was approved by the following vote of all present upon roll call as follows:

Yeas: Habgood Nays: Absent: Parmelee
 LoGrippo
 Katz
 Mackey
 Contract
 Dardia
 Root
 Mayor Brindle

Heretofore introduced, General Ordinance No. 2023-04 does now pass on first reading, and that said ordinance be further considered for final passage at a meeting to be held on the 28th day of February at 8:00 o'clock, p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter can be reached, in the Council Chambers, 425 East Broad Street, Westfield, New Jersey, and that at such time and place or any time and place to which such meeting shall from time to time be adjourned, all persons interested be given the opportunity to be heard concerning said ordinance, and that the Town Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to publish said ordinance according to law with a notice of its

introduction and passage on first reading and of the time and place when and where said ordinance will be further considered for final passage.

General Ordinance No. 2023-05

Regarding the following ordinance, Councilman Contract made the following announcement:

I hereby move that an ordinance entitled, “GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 2023-05 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE OF THE TOWN OF WESTFIELD”

The motion was seconded by Councilman Dardia.

General Ordinance No. 2023-05 was approved by the following vote of all present upon roll call as follows:

Yeas: Habgood	Nays:	Absent: Parmelee
LoGrippo		
Katz		
Mackey		
Contract		
Dardia		
Root		
Mayor Brindle		

Heretofore introduced, General Ordinance No. 2023-05 does now pass on first reading, and that said ordinance be further considered for final passage at a meeting to be held on the 28th day of February at 8:00 o'clock, p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter can be reached, in the Council Chambers, 425 East Broad Street, Westfield, New Jersey, and that at such time and place or any time and place to which such meeting shall from time to time be adjourned, all persons interested be given the opportunity to be heard concerning said ordinance, and that the Town Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to publish said ordinance according to law with a notice of its introduction and passage on first reading and of the time and place when and where said ordinance will be further considered for final passage.

General Ordinance No. 2023-06

Regarding the following ordinance, Councilman Contract made the following announcement:

I hereby move that an ordinance entitled, “GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 2023-06 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SIDEWALK CAFÉ ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF WESTFIELD”

The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Mackey.

General Ordinance No. 2023-06 was approved by the following vote of all present upon roll call as follows:

Yeas: Habgood	Nays:	Absent: Parmelee
LoGrippo		
Katz		
Mackey		
Contract		
Dardia		
Root		
Mayor Brindle		

Heretofore introduced, General Ordinance No. 2023-06 does now pass on first reading, and that said ordinance be further considered for final passage at a meeting to be held on the 28th day of February at 8:00 o'clock, p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter can be reached, in the Council Chambers, 425 East Broad Street, Westfield, New Jersey, and that at such time and place or any time and place to which such meeting shall from time to time be adjourned, all persons interested be given the opportunity to be heard concerning said ordinance, and that the Town Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to publish said ordinance according to law with a notice of its introduction and passage on first reading and of the time and place when and where said ordinance will be further considered for final passage.

Public Works Committee

The following resolution, introduced by Councilman Katz and seconded by Councilwoman Root, was unanimously adopted.

Resolution No. 62

WHEREAS, a need exists for the purchase of various landscape material for use by the Department of Public Works, as provided for in Public Works account 137-255, and

WHEREAS, sealed bids were received on Wednesday, February 8, 2023, and

WHEREAS, the low bid, submitted by Northern Nurseries of New Jersey, Inc., has been analyzed and found to be in conformance with the appropriate specifications, and

WHEREAS, Certificate of the Town Treasurer, certifying to the availability of adequate funds for this Contract, prepared in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:30 1.10 has been furnished to the Town Clerk. Expenditure of funds pursuant to this Contract to be charged to Public Works account 137-255, under Purchase Order 23-00490 in an amount not to exceed \$100,000.00 subject to funding in the 2023 adopted budget.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a Unit Price Contract be awarded to Northern Nurseries of New Jersey, Inc., and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the proper Town Officials be, and they are hereby, authorized to take whatever actions are appropriate in the execution of discharge of this Contract.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the proper Town Officials be, and they are hereby, authorized to take whatever actions are appropriate in the execution of discharge of this Contract.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn, made by Councilman LoGrippe and seconded by Councilwoman Habgood at 12:38 a.m. was unanimously carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Lawshe, RMC

Town Clerk