

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
June 17, 2010**

A. Chairperson Fort called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. announcing that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act had been met and that the meeting had been duly advertised.

Mrs. Fort	present
Mrs. Flynn	present
Ms. Hendry	present
Mr. Hendrickson	absent
Mr. Simon	present – arrived at 8:10 p.m.
Mr. Stettner	present
Mrs. Goodwin	present
Mr. Thompson	present
Mr. Denning	present

**Donald Moore, Esq., Kelleher & Moore
Michael Sullivan, Clark, Caton & Hintz
John Hansen, Ferriero Engineering
Steve Souza, Princeton Hydro**

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. May 20, 2010 Mr. Denning made a motion to approve the minutes. Mrs. Goodwin seconded the motion. *Motion* was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded.*

C. CORRESPONDENCE

1. Letter from Nelson D. Caparas, of Jacobs regarding the median opening modification on Route 22. – There were no comments from the board. This letter was for informational purposes only.

D. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

None

E. RESOLUTIONS:

None

F. VOUCHER APPROVAL: Mr. Denning made a motion to approve the vouchers as submitted. Mrs. Flynn seconded the motion. Ms. Hendry abstained. *Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.*

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Mark Hartman
Preliminary-Final Site Plan
Use and Bulk Variance, Minor Subdivision
US Rt. 22
Block 36, Lot 47 & 48
Action date: June 17, 2010**

Geoffrey Soriano, Esq., Soriano and Soriano stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. He testified that this matter is a continuation hearing.

Mr. Thompson informed the board that he had work personally performed by the applicant's brother and wanted to make sure that the board and applicant did not have a conflict with him continuing with hearing the application. The board and applicant did not feel that he had a conflict and asked that he continued to participate.

Mr. Soriano stated that at the last hearing held on May 20, 2010, most of the issues had been addressed. There were some lingering issues within Mr. Sullivan's report dated May 19, 2010. Those issues were addressed and resolved.

Exhibit A-22 – Plan prepared by Bohler Engineering site plan 3 of 23

Mr. Hartman stated that this exhibit was prepared by Bohler Engineering. The revision on the plan is under the bulk requirements block, which now shows a FAR of 0.31 and 0.47 if basements are approved.

Exhibit A-23 – dated 6-17-10 – Prepared by Daniel Ward Architect revised 6-9-10.

Mr. Hartman testified that the second sheet of the plan reveals the western and eastern side elevation. This is the "carriage house". On the fourth page identified as the "stable" which is building C, it reveals the western and eastern elevation. Additionally, the building identified as the "barn" indicates the eastern and western elevation on the plan.

Mr. Sullivan was concerned about the amount of the signs that are shown on the plans.

Mr. Soriano addressed §6.2 – Landscape design, buffers and plantings pertaining to Lot 47 – the applicant is not proposing to comply with the minimum planting requirements, buffer requirements, the screening requirements, shade tree requirements, etc. The effort is to improve the conditions on the property, not necessarily complying with the ordinance. The applicant is requesting relief from the ordinance. Madam Chair stated that she would like to see some shade trees planted along the new access off of Coddington Road. The applicant agreed.

Regarding Lot 48, item number 7 of Mr. Sullivan’s report, speaks about the buffer along Route 22. No buffering is proposed by the applicant. There will be nothing to screen. A double row of shade trees and shrub massing is proposed to break up the view. The trees along the pedestrian walkway will be moved closer to the green area. Additionally, Mr. Sullivan requested that the applicant make use of exposed aggregate concrete as an alternative instead of the stamped concrete for the walkway. Mr. Hartman agreed.

The “coming soon” signs will be temporary and will be displayed for 30 days.

Regarding Mr. Hansen’s report, the applicant has agreed to comply with all of the conditions.

Mr. Thompson was concerned about renting the retail stores. Mr. Hartman answered that he felt confident with the farmer’s market taking place on the weekends, he would be able to rent the stores.

Mr. Moore had in his notes that fencing should be installed around the detention basin; the applicant will remove the existing free standing sign on the FX Auto Center which is approximately 10 feet from the right-of-way and exceeds the height requirement and replace same with a compliant sign; the inter-parcel cross access easement will be required to allow the users of Lot 48 to traverse to Lot 47 in order to reach Coddington Road and NJDOT may require proof of this easement in order to grant an access permit. The community room would be restricted to tenants use. One of the units must stay as a manager’s residence.

Mrs. Flynn made a motion to approve the application. Mr. Denning seconded the motion.

Mrs. Goodwin felt this was a great idea. She was in favor of the application and felt that it would be good for the community.

Ms. Hendry stated that it meets the criteria for the application.

Mrs. Flynn stated that the negative criteria did not out weigh the position criteria for this application. The final project will be an asset for the entire community.

Mr. Denning stated that he supported the application. He felt it would great for the community. It will remediate some issues on the adjacent lot.

Mr. Simon stated that he is concerned about the size of the project on this small piece of land. However, he felt that the positive aspects of this project will be successful.

Mr. Thompson disagreed with supporting the application. He stated that he lives close to the site. He felt that the development is too much for the site. The amount of parking spaces seems excessive.

Mr. Stettner stated that he felt that the architect did a wonderful job. He hopes that the retail stores will be rented and he supports the application.

Chairman Fort stated that the whole retail/restaurant use area is appropriate especially adjacent to the Fallon application. It has the potential to become a community center. The Route 22 corridor is where this type of development belongs.

Roll Call:

Mr. Denning	aye
Mrs. Flynn	aye
Ms. Hendry	aye
Mr. Simon	aye
Mr. Stettner	aye
Mr. Thompson	aye
Madam Chair	aye

The board took a break.

- 2. Hunterdon Hills Animal Hospital
Block 21.13, Lot 7
Route 22 Eastbound
Variance & Preliminary & Final Site Plan
Action date: July 16, 2010**

Ms. Hendry recused herself from this application.

Mr. Moore swore in all of the witnesses and the board's professionals.

Anthony Koester, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. He testified that this is the third appearance for the applicant. The construction sequencing was an issue at the last meeting. This was addressed at the site visit that

occurred on Sunday, June 13, 2010. Based upon the site visit, Mr. Bayer prepared a construction sequencing plan. This was submitted to the board.

A-5 Sequencing plan revised date June 7, 2010

Additionally, part of the sequencing plan was to obtain approval and/or agreements from the neighbors for the use of their property for the parking. There is a signed agreement with Van Doren. This allows parking for one year for the applicant's employees. There is another licensed agreement in concept with Joanzee, LLC for the parking on the other side for the contractors.

A-6 Letter from Van Doren

Ted Bayer, Bayer –Risse Engineering stated that the construction staging plan was prepared on June 7, 2010 and that the stakes that were set in the ground for the site walk were based upon this plan. On the Van Doren site they are proposing to have the employee parking, with a construction walkway to the existing hospital. There is an opportunity to access construction equipment when the storm water infiltration system is being built. This would provide broad access.

The surface of the walkways will be mulched. They will be sided by a chain-link fence. The pedestrians will have one place to walk. The pathways are 5 feet wide. They are also proposing temporary patient parking on the west side of the parking lot. This would be a gravel surface and will be removed once the facility is built. They are proposing to install two gates for pedestrian access and safety.

Mrs. Goodwin asked how long would this parking arrangement be in effect.

Scott Brancy stated that he owns a construction company by the name of Trimbel Brancy Structures located in Montague New Jersey. He stated that he consulted with Dr. Westfield regarding the construction of this property. Regarding the length of time for the overlap in the parking arrangement, he testified that it could be between two to three months, depending on the weather. He stated that it would take approximately five to six months to construct the building shell. The first stage is to build the shell, and then remove the existing building; the majority of the detention basin will be located underneath that building. The entire construction will take approximately 10 to 11 months.

Madam Chair Fort stated that during the site visit some issues became apparent to her. She was concerned with the number of parking spaces. Also, she wanted to know how many employees are on site at one time. Dr. Westfield answered that the number varies from day to day. It could be 7 to 8 or as many as 10 employees. In the new building they are anticipating 10 to 11 employees.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the plan shows 29 parking spaces. Two parking spaces are barrier free. Since the applicant is proposing to have 10 to 12 employees on site at any one time, and there could be some shift cross over, 10 to 15 clients at a time, in the context of this it seems that the number of parking spaces fits the need.

Madam Chair had previously asked the applicant if the “dairy barn” structure could be reduced. He indicated that it could not be. She stated that she was looking for ways to make the proposed construction fit the site.

Attorney Koester informed the board that the applicant would be willing to bank parking spaces if the board required it.

Ted Bayer, Bayer-Risse Engineering stated that the construction phasing plan has been revised. This was revised pursuant to a meeting that took place with the board’s professionals on June 3, 2010. There was a “neck or throat” that separated the rear parking area from the front area. This has now been removed.

Exhibit A-7 – Colored rendering markup of the construction staging plan, dated June 17, 2010.

Mr. Bayer demonstrated on the plan where the 300 foot setback exists from Rockaway Creek. They have created a more conventional parking lot layout. The circular drive has been eliminated. The “neck or throat” has been eliminated. They have 24 foot aisles. The parking lot complies with the ordinance. An area has been reserved for solid waste management and generator. Since the riparian forested buffer has been pulled back approximately 100 feet, the net lot area has increased. Previously the net lot area had been calculated to be 0.553 acres. Under the new calculations the net lot area increases to 1.135 acres. The actual gross area of the building is 8,617 sf. On that basis, the proposed impervious coverage is now 0.462 percent, and the Floor Area Ratio is 0.176 percent. The total new net impervious coverage is 10,681 sf. The total proposed impervious coverage is 22,836 sf.

Mr. Bayer referred to Michael Sullivan’s report dated May 20, 2010, specifically at page 4 which demonstrates the zoning table. The first variance is for FAR. Previously the existing conditions was 0.2031, the current proposed FAR is 0.176. The front yard set back remains at 25 feet. The maximum impervious coverage previously was 1.03 and now it has been reduced to 0.462. These items require a variance. Regarding page 6, site layout, the gross floor area of the building has gone from 8,683 sf to 8,716 sf. They are proposing 29 parking spaces as opposed to 26 parking spaces. There is no need for a loading dock. A planting detail revision will be submitted. The site lighting will comply with the ordinance. The free standing sign will compliment the building. The cupola will now contain windows.

Exhibit A-8 – Rendering prepared by the architect revised June 17, 2010.

The applicant will prepare revised plans and submit same in time for the professional's review prior to the next meeting which is set for July 15, 2010. No further notice will be given and this matter will be continued on July 15, 2010.

H ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Denning made a motion to adjourn @10:45 p.m. Mr. Stettner seconded the motion. *Motion* was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded.*

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Jacukowicz