

On September 11th Maplewood Township received eight responses to its Request for Information. On September 12th the names of the respondents were put on the Maplewood website, and more recently selected pages of the responses were posted on the website. A citizen in Maplewood has filed a Open Public Records Act (OPRA) request to see the remaining portions the responses but has been told that the responses are proprietary and therefore not subject to OPRA.

The following pages summarize all the information that can be gleaned from the pages that have been released. All designs are required to follow the zoning regulations adopted by the Township in July.

The zoning allows for design flexibility, as summarized on the following page. The nine proposals received can be placed in to three broad categories:

- Emphasis on increasing and enhancing public spaces and parking (one proposal)
- Emphasis similar to the first category, balanced with the addition of buildings similar in scale to existing Village buildings (one proposal)
- Emphasis on “transit village” concepts that provide a high-density mixture of new store(s) and 24-30 dwelling units (seven proposals)

The Township intends to select three of these for further consideration, and then choose one before the end of the year. There are no plans to show the public any additional information regarding these proposals before the choice is made.

IMPORTANT POST OFFICE SITE ZONING REGULATIONS

(Detailed explanation of the zoning can be found [here](#).)

The types of construction permitted at the Post Office site has been documented in the zoning that was approved by the Township Committee in July, 2013. The complete document can be found [here](#).

The bullets below highlight the factors that relate most strongly to the size and use of the site. They allow a wide variety of building types, sizes, building usages, parking, open spaces, etc.

- Total ground area of buildings is allowed to be **up to** 19,800 square feet (60% of the total site size of 33,000 square feet)
- Open space(s) totaling 1500 sq ft **or more**
- Retail use, if a grocery, of **up to** 15,000 square feet
- Retail use, if of other types: **up to** 4,000 square feet for each store
- A **mixture** of offices, financial, hotel, restaurants, community facilities, open space is permitted
- **Up to** 25 dwelling units are permitted
- Equivalent of 33 existing **public** parking spaces must be provided on-site **or** moved off-site a “reasonable walking distance”
- Heights **exceeding** tallest structures in town are permitted, **shorter** heights also permitted*
- “Massing” describes **largest** allowable heights and foot print—that is, overall **maximum** allowed size based on ground area and height. **Less** massing is permitted.

*Heights along Maplewood Avenue and Ricalton Square must be lower

	NAME OF COMPANY SUBMITTING TO TOWNSHIP				
	RPM	L&M	Wainco	Sharbell	Langan
Location	Montclair	Robbinsville, NJ	South Orange	Robbinsville	Elmwood Park
Architect	Unknown*	Beyer Blinder Belle	Ring	Feinberg and Assoc.	G3
Concept Drawings?	Unknown*	Unknown	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*
Retail	5200 sq ft	Unknown	Ground floor	Retail/Commerical 3500-7000 sq ft	Yes
Kings?	Maybe Kings, or smaller boutique spaces	Unknown	Yes	Maybe. Some reservations	Lead Tenant
Postal Services?	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Residential	24 units	Yes	Yes	30 units	Yes
Building	12,200 sq ft	Unknown	Not described	L shaped	Unknown*
Parking	33 public spaces, 13 retail spaces. Residential spaces in a basement garage	Unknown	"maintain existing parking"	Unknown*	13 grade level spaces upperpavilion??
Public Space	1700 sq ft plaza "green space"	Unknown	Unknown*	Public access on eastern side? Small green space near Ricalton Sq.	Unknown
Relationship to NJT	Pedestrian path "conserves and improves access to train station"	Unknown	Unknown*	Unknown*	Unknown
Other Design Aspects		State that site would accommodate one of the "L&M's multiple models"	States that: As gateway from north, will set tone for Village. Emphasizes design that provides next-generation urban mixed use living; upscale, sophisticated transit hub lifestyle.	Unknown	Unknown
Landownership	Land would be sold to developer	Land would be sold to developer	Land would be sold to developer	Land would be sold to developer	Land would be sold to developer
Other Info		Expressed desire to engage community.	Describes finding the right mix of uses (retail/residential) as a challenge. Emphasizes experience of new tenants without discussing impact on Village and existing residents. Describes neighborhood and trade-area as "limitations"		

*The portion of information published by the town indicates that details for this item were provided in portions of the respondents proposal that were not published by the Town. "Unknown", without an accompanying asterisk, means that the materials released by the township do not address the topic.

	NAME OF COMPANY SUBMITTING TO TOWNSHIP			
	Kander Sechzer 1	Kander Sechzer 2	Petrucci	Murray
Location	Maplewood	Maplewood	Asbury Park	Millburn
Architect	Kander Sechzer	Kander Sechzer	Minno and Wasko	Unknown
Concept Designs?	Yes	Yes	No	Unknown
Retail	None	10-12 rentable spaces; proposed studios/galleries; possible offices and/or retail	4950 sq ft	Unknown
Kings?	No Supermarket	No Supermarket	Unknown	Unknown
Postal Services?	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Residential	None	None	25 units	Unknown
Building	None on PO Site; small Bldg. on Ricalton Sq.	Adds Two story – Approx. 6500 SF footprint	3 stories, third floor set back	Unknown
Parking	Adds approx. 20-25 spaces	A “wash” – approx. same # of spaces in redesigned locations	7 additional parking spaces. Parking Plan submitted*	Unknown
Public Space	“Public living room” located in a small structure in a re-designed, expanded Ricalton Park	“Public living room” as in concept 1 plus bldg. noted above	“public green” included	Unknown
Relationship to NJT	Access to NJT at both tunnels improved - allees marking pathways	Pedestrian “street” through building on PO site; Allee at north end	Unknown	Unknown
Other Design Aspects	Small scale intimate to complement context of Village; integrates train and town	Small scale intimate to complement context of Village; integrates train and town	Brick and cast stone	
Landownership	Township retains land ownership	Township may retain some or all land ownership	Land would be sold to developer	Land would be sold to developer
Other Comments	Improved public green for village events	Concept 2 builds upon Concept 1 as a combo on expanded Ricalton Square and PO site	Developed Station House	Murray is known to have visited site and TC meetings before RFI was released. Murray has developed Kings supermarkets in nearby towns.

*The portion of information published by the town indicates that details for this item were provided in portions of the respondents proposal that were not published by the Town.

“Unknown”, without an accompanying asterisk, means that the materials released by the township do not address the topic.

Miscellaneous Remarks

Does basement level parking mean at the same level as the post office basement, i.e., exposed on the Village Coffee side? Or is this below that level?

What does 3 stories mean? Measured from which point on the sloped lot?

The language around parking is vague in most proposals—net change in number of public spaces relative to current situation is not always clear.

While most proposals suggest 24-30 units, they seem to vary considerable in some related parameters (parking, green space, building foot print, retail space) making it is hard to compare them on any of these other aspects.

No mention of residential unit sizes...so overall structure size is impossible to even guess.

Square footage of retail space is generally small in cases it is mentioned—not clear that the direction developers are headed in this regard is making sufficient room for a Kings.

Access to train seems to mean only extending the path from the Ricalton side to the Baker street side....we have to see the plans. Most plans do not consider more extensive ways to improve pedestrian and visual connectivity with train station and tunnels.

Few of the documents discuss impact on Village, or any analysis of what aspects complement existing Village. Most lean on the “transit village” concept as the justification for their choices. Some emphasize how the proposal itself will make the experience of new tenants exceptional.