

Approved *AKK*
7/8/2020

MAY 20, 2020 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SESSION
DMR ARCHITECTS' DRAFT REPORT OF FORMER CICCOLINI PROPERTY

The Board went into Executive Session at 7:19 p.m. Present were:

Ms. Castro, Mr. Malfitano, Mr. Contella, Mr. Kirk, Ms. Kucinski, Mr. Del Tufo,
Mr. Arcuti, Mr. Smith, Ms. Tangorra, Mr. Kozyra, Commissioner Scarpelli and
Mayor Tucci

Francis Reiner, Professional Planner, DMR Architects, 777 Terrace Ave, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey 07604, presented a PowerPoint slide show with respect to the 92-page draft report which was forwarded by counsel to all Board Members prior to this meeting.

On March 19, 2019, the Township passed a Resolution for the 22 properties ("Ciccolini Property") between Vreeland Avenue and High Street to be the subject of DMR's rehabilitation/redevelopment investigation. The steps DMR took are as follows: Step 1 – Investigation; Step 2 – Redevelopment Plan; and Step 3 – Site Plan Application. DMR requested available Township department reports on all properties neighboring the Ciccolini building. The Ciccolini building is the only building that DMR entered for its investigation. Once the Planning Board reviews/discusses DMR's Investigation Report publicly, the Board will decide if DMR's report should be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners.

The Investigation Report consists of building, fire and police department records; tax assessor records; site visits and visual inspections; sewer and water records; and property records and photo inventory.

Redevelopment requires that the property(ies) meet 1 of 8 criteria with or without condemnation (not part of this study), and reviewing a PILOT (Payment in Lieu of Taxes) program. The Report states that some of the buildings are unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated and lacking adequate light. Mr. Reiner feels some buildings on the Property are conducive to unhealthy living or working conditions. The only lots not in need of redevelopment are Lots 40 and 41.

Mr. Reiner's recommendations are as follows: if rehabilitation is decided then all properties will be designated. If redevelopment is decided then only municipal properties will be designated.

Rehabilitation requires meeting 3 criteria: the buildings have to be 50+ years old (which these are) and be in need of repair (which they are), and being eligible for a tax abatement on the properties. The Ciccolini Property meets Criteria #2. The Report states that many of the properties are deteriorating and many are vacant. Much of the water and sewer infrastructure is in need of replacement maintenance due to its age. Mr. Reiner feels that rehabilitation may prevent further deterioration. He stated that rehabilitation is needed for all of the properties, not individual lots.

Mr. Malfitano had a question regarding non-street facing properties. Mr. Reiner said that those properties will likely be replaced. Time limits could be put on developers, specifically for

development of Lots 31 and 32. Mr. Malfitano asked about Lot 30 and Mr. Reiner replied that it is a parking lot with access into a lot more suitable for development.

Ms. Tangorra asked about setting timeframes for developers who have not been inside the buildings. Mr. Reiner stated this was a good idea because he is concerned that attorneys might reach out to the property owners and start out by saying “Do you know”

Mr. Smith asked if the designations occur, does Mr. Reiner feel there will be challenges? Mr. Reiner replied if any, very few.

Mr. Arcuti asked if there is a \$3.5 to \$4 million tax abatement on Lots 26-30, then what incentive is there for developers? Mr. Reiner replied that in the opinion of some Bergen County municipalities the five year abatement is not enough of an incentive, they need a 30 year PILOT. He feels that without a PILOT no developer will show an interest.

Mr. Del Tufo asked the difference between redevelopment and rehabilitation zoning. Mr. Reiner replied that there is a three step process: (1) investigation; (2) redevelopment designation; and (3) redevelopment plan.

Commissioner Scarpelli asked what the difference is between an RFP and an RFQ. Mr. Reiner replied an RFP – Request for Proposal is the process of interviewing and selecting a developer. An RFQ – Request for Qualifications is the way to get rid of some possibilities. Mayor Tucci asked if the Board should do an RFQ to see what developers propose. Mr. Reiner replied that you have to be careful because getting multiple developers’ ideas and then merging them will not work if the Board then goes with an RFP. An RFQ is less intense. An RFP provides more concept opportunities.

Commissioner Scarpelli asked what Mr. Reiner feels the Board’s next steps should be and Mr. Reiner suggested that the Board should have a public meeting, take the public feedback, along with the Board’s meeting outcomes, and make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. Mr. Kozyra suggested that the members of the Board review DMR’s report to make sure everyone understands everything that was reviewed tonight and then a public meeting can be set for some time in the near future. Once a public meeting has been scheduled and takes place the Board needs to meet again to make the decision about what is to be presented to the Commissioners. Mayor Tucci asked if Mr. Reiner was agreeable to reappear before the Board to discuss any further questions the Board may have at the June 3 meeting.

Mr. Reiner agreed to appear at the next meeting scheduled for June 3, 2020

At 8:24 p.m. the Board adjourned to return to public session.