

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
February 16, 2006**

Chairperson Fort called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. announcing that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act had been met and that the meeting had been duly advertised.

A.

Mrs. Fort	present	
Mrs. Flynn	present	
Mrs. Goodwin	absent	
Ms. Hendry	present	
Mr. Stettner	absent	
Mr. Shepherd	present	arrived at 8:00 p.m. and left at 10:00 p.m.
Mr. Staats	present	
Mr. Thompson	present	
Mr. Denning	present	

**Donald Moore, Esq., Kelleher & Moore
John Hansen, Ferriero Engineering
Michael Sullivan, Clarke, Caton & Hintz
Scott Parker, Edwards & Kelsey**

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. January 19, 2006

Mr. Staats made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Denning seconded the motion. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, nays none recorded.*

C. CORRESPONDENCE:

The secretary read the correspondence into the record. Mr. Moore addressed the correspondence from the Hunterdon County Housing Corp. He stated that this entity was informed that the Board of Adjustment would not waive the application fee. A fee waiver was only allowed in the past under dire circumstances. He did request that if an application was filed, that the professionals' keep their escrow fees to a minimum.

A letter from William Robertson, Esq., attorney for the Commerce Bank dated February 1, 2006 was received by the board. Mr. Robertson requested in this letter that in lieu of a formal application, could this letter be accepted to address the concerns of the Methodist Church. The church does not want the sidewalk constructed on their property. This was originally a condition of approval for the Commerce Bank application. It was determined that this letter would not suffice as an appropriate method of obtaining the change to the approval and that the applicant would have to submit an amended final application and provide adequate notice to the public.

Regarding the CVS project, Mr. Hansen forwarded a letter to H. Clay McEldowney indicating that the site plan was reviewed and was acceptable with the original approval. Also, a letter was received from H. Clay McEldowney dated February 3, 2006 and it dealt with the fact that certain board members were concerned that trees were removed at the CVS site that were not authorized or indicated on the site plan. A representative from his office examined the existing site conditions as compared to the drawings and it shows that the location of the pre-existing vegetation. It identifies those trees which were to be removed as well as those which were to remain. Based upon that inspection, the clearing of the trees has been carried out in accordance with the approved plan.

Mrs. Fort wanted to know the name of the arborist that Ms. Hendry had recommended. Ms. Hendry stated that he had performed work at her firm. It was recommended that Ms. Hendry would contact him and set up a time for an interview with Mr. Sullivan.

D. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

1. Omnipoint Communications, Inc.
Block 61, lot 5.02
Rt. 31 & Foothill Road
Preliminary Major Site Plan & Variance
Action date: February 23, 2006

Mrs. Flynn informed the board that the TRC recommended that this matter should be deemed complete.

Mr. Denning made a motion to deem the application complete. Mrs. Flynn made a motion to deem the application complete. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, nays none recorded.*

2. Joazee, L.L.C.
Block 21, 13 Lot 6
409 Route 22E.

Variance

Action date: March 10, 2006

Mrs. Flynn stated that it was the TRC's determination that this application is incomplete. She stated that it was unclear what the applicant is proposing. They need more information, perhaps from the zoning officer. During the meeting it was discussed that a certification from the zoning officer should be implemented. The certification could be a part of the checklist requirement.

Madam Chair stated that she would contact the zoning officer for this information. Mr. Staats stated that it should state the zoning ordinance violation section.

3 Paul & Joya Riner
Use Variance
14A Kline Boulevard
Action date: March 11, 2006

Mrs. Flynn informed the board that the TRC recommended that this matter should be deemed complete.

Mr. Denning made a motion to deem the application complete. Mrs. Flynn made a motion to deem the application complete. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, nays none recorded.*

E. RESOLUTIONS:

1. Report on Variance Applications for 2005

Mr. Denning made a motion to approve the resolution. Mr. Staats seconded the motion.

Roll call:

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

2. Resolution Authorizing Professional Services Contract

This matter would be carried to the next meeting.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Thomas A. Foreman
Appeal
Block 58, lot 7**

This matter is carried to March 16, 2006.

- 2. Our Lady Of Lourdes Church
Block 28, lot 10
Preliminary Major Site Plan
Action date: Signed extension and carried to February 16, 2006**

Michael Denning recused himself from this application since he is a member of the church.

Phil Simms, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. He stated that at the last hearing, the applicant made their presentation regarding the enlargement of the parking lot at the church. The applicant at that time was asked to engage a traffic expert. The reconfiguration of the parking lot posed a lot of concern that was expressed in the professional reports. He stated that the church is expanding the parking lot to benefit their parishioners and the residents who live along Pulaski Road. There is no economic benefit for the church to enlarge this parking lot. The plans have been revised to reflect some of the professional's comments. Mr. Simms stated that what they have proposed probably still does not meet the ordinance.

Mr. Moore swore in the following witnesses: Gary Dean; Scott Parker; Michael Sullivan and John Hansen.

Gary Dean stated that he is a professional engineer licensed in the State of New Jersey. His expertise is traffic. He stated that they performed Sunday morning parking lot counts at the existing church, overlapping the time of the 9:30 a.m. service and the 11:00 a.m. service. His staff counted the traffic at 6 areas. It has been recognized that there are some periods when there is insufficient parking at the church and parishioners are parking along Pulaski Road and Mimosa Street. The clergy lot, the main church lot, the temporary parking area, and Pulaski Road and Mimosa Street were counted. The peak amount of cars was before the 11:00 a.m. service. There were 266 cars parked. He submitted his report dated February 3, 2006 to the board. The application seeks to provide additional paved parking to eliminate the bank parking area and the "on street" parking. They are proposing 272 parking spaces. Mr. Dean stated that he had consulted the issue of the parking spaces with Mr. Parker and Mr. Hansen. The outcome of those discussions was a desire to reduce some of the impervious coverage at the driveway openings. The church is amendable to that idea. The church has agreed to reduce the parking spaces to a 9 ½ foot width. This size is slightly larger than the ordinance allows, in

order to accommodate older persons and children getting out of the vehicle without impacting the vehicle next to them.

Mr. Hansen stated that in his report he suggested that the size of the parking spaces be 9' x 18' so that they could gain almost 2,000 square feet reduction of impervious coverage. Since the applicant has issues with the size of the detention basin, they have made some improvements, and they are still struggling with the size of the basin. His rationale was that they could meet the minimum standards, reduce coverage, and have some more planting areas and reduce the amount of stormwater basin that they need to provide.

Ms. Hendry wanted to know the basis of Mr. Dean's calculation for the amount of parking spaces. Mr. Dean answered that they need a run of 18 parking spaces at $\frac{1}{2}$ a space per foot. Some of the islands in the parking lot are there to protect the existing trees. The only way to gain the extra parking space is to cut down the tree and physically remove the island.

Ms. Hendry stated that Mr. Dean has testified that there is not enough parking in the lot, however, the numbers show that the lot is not filled to capacity most of the time that it was observed. Mr. Dean testified that he cannot guarantee that cars will not be parked along the streets. This would have to be secured by the governing body to enact a "no parking zone" on Pulaski Road.

Madam Chair stated that she had a prior resolution dated 1989 for an amendment to their original site plan. There were concerns from adjoining property owners relative to parking along Pulaski Road during services at the church. Apparently members of the church in order to short cut their walk to the services had elected to park along Pulaski Road rather than in the parking lot. The church was supposed to keep a log of any violators over the next 6 months and if violations were to continue then it was to be reported to the Board of Adjustment for further possible action which may include a request to the township committee to eliminate all parking along Pulaski Road and in the vicinity of the church or the installation of additional parking on site among other alternatives. Mrs. Fort stated that this is not a new problem. Madam Chair stated that she inquired with our police department if there were any problems with traffic, but to date have not received a call back. Mrs. Fort wanted to know when Mr. Dean's firm did the count was this a normal service, not a pancake breakfast. Mr. Dean answered that it was just a normal service day. Also when they counted the stationary cars in the parking lot at intervals, Madam Chair wanted to know if any count was performed at the egress or ingress indicating from which direction the traffic was coming. Mr. Dean answered no.

Mr. Staats stated that the testimony given was that they had 125 cars off site parked during special services or holidays. He wanted to know did Mr. Dean take into account where these cars would be parked. Mr. Dean answered no.

Mr. Staats wanted to know if the easterly driveway of the parking lot could be closed and just use the one driveway. Mr. Dean stated that it makes ingress and egress very difficult.

Mr. Parker stated that he is more comfortable with a single exiting lane in each driveway. The idea that to empty the parking lot in a short window of time, and having 2 left turn movements and 2 right turn movements all in a relatively short section of roadway could become a confusing situation. Regarding the parking on Pulaski Road, since it is a short period of time one day a week, he would prefer to have parking in a parking lot if it is available. He stated that in the event that there is significant demand placed on the parking lot during special holidays and to prohibit their ability to park on the streets near the church, they would be parking on Pulaski Road even further down, walking on the road for a greater distance. If the police department indicates that there have been accidents, he did not feel that a couple of vehicles on a Sunday morning would represent a significant problem.

Mr. Parker stated regarding the eastern most driveway, he did not take into account the existing trees and islands dictating the layout of the parking lot, but the driveway should be aligned directly with one of the drive aisle within the parking lot.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the variance that the applicant seeks is the relationship of the access point to the intersecting street.

Mrs. Fort asked Mr. Hansen if the parking could be placed north of the existing parking lot. This would create an opening in the arborvitae line and install parking near the convent. Mr. Hansen stated that it could work, but from an engineering standpoint there are problems with lot 7. There is a ridge line that runs through the existing parking lot and most of it drains to the existing basin. The area to the north drains towards Route 523. To remove the trees in that area, install pavement and curbing, they would have to collect a significant amount of stormwater. This basin would need an outfall. Therefore, a large amount of excavating would have to be constructed in order to install a pipe that would run out to the Route 523 storm system. This would be approximately 400-500 feet run and cutting through steep slopes to access that system.

Ms. Hendry wanted to know how many trees are slated to be removed if the parking spaces added are proposed by the applicant. Mr. Sullivan answered approximately 12 trees. Ms. Hendry stated that the argument that she hears from the applicant is that they do not want to make the parking spaces smaller because they have to leave the trees that are presently there in the parking lot, however, by keeping the spaces at the same larger size we need to add additional impervious cover and in addition remove 12 trees.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Richard Gardella stated that his mother-in-law, Marilyn Corcoran lives at 1 Pulaski Road. He wanted to know how many Sunday mornings did Mr. Dean perform his count. Mr. Dean answered that the only count occurred on the 22nd. of January, 2006.

Dawn Corcoran Gardella stated since the last hearing in August, she kept track of the number of cars on Saturday and Sunday. She will enter this information into the record at a later time. She asked if the increase to the parking spaces was based upon one mass that occurred once a week. Mr. Dean stated that there will be times that less parking is required.

James J. Mantz stated that he is a licensed professional engineer and land surveyor in the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Mantz stated that he revised the plans in light of the comments from the board's professionals.

**Exhibit A-3 Plan dated 12/28/05,
Exhibit A-4 Amended Plan dated 2/16/06 which shows the change in the curbing to have 1 exit lane at each entrance/exit.**

Mr. Mantz stated that at the last meeting there were questions regarding the size of the detention basin and what would happen to the stormwater. He stated that he met with Mr. Hansen in December. They reviewed the drainage requirements. Since that time he has amended the site plan to remove several parking spaces near the southeast corner of the easterly bay parking lots to expand the detention basin. Mr. Hansen indicated that he is still not satisfied. The peak flow out of the detention basin for a 10 year storm exceeds the allowable by 2%. He is now prepared to modify the outlet orifice to comply with the requirement which is 75%.

Mr. Mantz testified that the landscaping plan has been changed to Sheet 3 of 8 and indicates additional plantings along the easterly side of the property line. He stated that the church is working within a tight budget. He is working with a committee at the church to come up with a planting plan. It was their opinion that the landscaping is adequate for purposes of screening the parking lot since the parking lot is only being used for one day. He has broken up the view of the parking lot with the plantings, plus they have attempted to screen it. The applicant still does not meet the requirement of the ordinance, but they feel that they are doing an adequate job.

Mrs. Flynn stated that in the previous resolutions for the expansion of the property, a reoccurring item of concern was the buffering. There are resolutions dating from 1985 that state that the adjoining residential properties will be

protected since there will be no expansion of the parking area. The resolution goes on to state how the parking area will be buffered and this will provide protection for the adjoining property owners. Mr. Mantz stated that it is a give and take situation. Mrs. Flynn stated that the intensity of the use on the property is increasing and the adjoining residents' properties are still there. So wouldn't it stand to reason that more buffering should be provided and not just the minimum or the most that your client can afford, because their property is being affected by your actions. There are alternatives. The church could have another mass. Then the parking lot would not overflow.

Mr. Thompson stated that what he is hearing is a contradiction. On the one hand the church desperately needs to expand the parking lot because of the usage and on the hand the applicant is saying that it is only used one day a week so we don't need to plant the required amount of buffering. If you insist that the expansion is needed, then the applicant should provide adequate protection to the neighbors.

Mrs. Fort stated that it is her understanding that the buffering is to hide the parking lot, not the cars.

Mr. Sullivan stated that there is existing vegetation on the northern boundary of the parking lot. This is not as critical on the north side. This assumes that the vegetation is going to remain there and it is the rear of the yards. Mr. Sullivan recommended that this area be reinforced with a narrow row of plant material in case there ever was a need. The eastern boundary is extremely critical. The plantings that are proposed are in a swale. There is nothing that is right about this planting plan from a cultural standpoint for supporting these plants. Planting Norway Spruces in a swale will insure their demise. Mr. Sullivan testified that there is a requirement that is layered on top of this for screening parking areas. The applicant is required to provide a 4 foot high screening which is applicable along Pulaski Road. Currently the plans do not meet that requirement.

Ms. Hendry wanted to know if the applicant is proposing new trees being added to the interior of the existing parking lot or whether they are solely using the trees that currently exist within the islands.

Mr. Mantz testified that they are proposing 5 new trees in the interior of the parking lot where the parking lot currently exists.

Ms. Hendry stated that currently there are 24 parking spaces per row, but if the islands were changed could they add 2 additional parking spaces per row rather than just one. Mr. Mantz answered that the islands would have to be made narrower, but there would not be sufficient space within the island to plant a tree.

Ms. Hendry asked if it was worthwhile to take down additional trees at the back of the lot and increase impervious coverage versus adding 5 new trees and

keeping these existing stunted trees. Mr. Hansen answered that it is not a good trade off, but to get the parking lot design to obtain the additional spaces is the only way it could be done.

Mrs. Fort wanted to know if they left the plan as it is in terms of new trees and size and space and then improved the deficiency in the peripheral buffer, especially along Pulaski Road and along the eastern border would that be a acceptable compromise. Mr. Sullivan suggested that they use stacked parking design.

Mr. Moore suggested that the board should give Mr. Sullivan direction as far as their priority to meet the buffering requirement and delegate authority to Mr. Sullivan to meet with the applicant's representative to come up with a compromise. The applicant might never meet the requirements.

Mr. Thompson was concerned that whether this expansion was truly needed. He stated that there was only 1 traffic count performed.

Mr. Shepherd wanted to know if the entrance and exits were resolved. He didn't think so. Mr. Hansen stated that the variance will remain because if the applicant was forced into a situation where they only had one access they would withdraw the application.

Mr. Simms wanted to know if they board felt that the additional parking spaces were needed.

Mrs. Flynn stated that she did not think that the applicant provided adequate testimony that the parking spaces were needed, however, churches have large functions and holidays with overflow parking. She would be in favor of granting the extra parking, but that would only be contingent that they meet the buffer requirements.

Ms. Hendry stated that the parking lot is being designed for peak main service. There are other alternatives that have not been discussed by the applicant. Stacked parking is an option, changes in the mass schedule and off site parking that could be arranged. This expanded parking lot will sit empty 90% of the time.

Mrs. Fort stated that she was opposed to stacked parking because there would be families with young children.

Mr. Thompson requested that more studies should be performed regarding the parking lot count. He stated that one Sunday count was not sufficient.

Mr. Shepherd stated that "difficult times require difficult solutions". It appears to him that by granting this variance they are taking the simplest and easiest way out as to what the applicant would like to accomplish. Rather than take

the way out that might be somewhat inconvenient for some people on a Sunday for 1 hour.

Mr. Staats stated that he would like to see more plantings along Pulaski Road.

Mr. Simms stated that the outstanding matters cannot be worked out at this meeting. He requested that the professionals meet and work the outstanding matters prior to the next meeting. This matter was carried to March 16, 2006 with no further notice to the public.

The board took a 5 minute break.

- 3. CharDham Hindu Temple/Readington
Use Variance & Preliminary Site Plan
25A Coddington Road
Action date: March 17, 2006**

Mrs. Fort reviewed the hearing process procedures to the public.

Lloyd Tubman, Esq., stated that she is the attorney for the applicant. She stated that the property is located in the ROM-2 zone in which a house of worship is not a permitted use. She stated that she noticed for a use variance. The property is 28.78 acres and they are proposing approximately 30,000 square, 2 story temple. The board will be provided a transcript of each hearing since this will take multiple hearings.

Ms. Tubman stated that in Mr. Sullivan's report, he indicated that there might be a possibility of another variance. In the ROM-2 zone, there is an exception which allows certain additional height for such structures as elevator shafts or stairwell enclosures. In this case, they are requesting to enforce the entirety of a conditional use that is Ordinance Section 148.30, which specifically addresses houses of worship and exempts church steeples from the height measurement. She did not believe an additional height variance was required, although she will notice for same in the future.

Ms. Tubman informed the board that she will have ultimately the following 6 witnesses: Yogesh Mistry, Architect; Brian Bosenberg, Landscape Architect; James Hill, Engineer; Gary Dean, Traffic Engineer; Elizabeth McKenzie, Planner and Matt Murello, Noise expert. Due to the lateness of the hour, James Hill will give an overview of the property and will not go into technical detail.

Mr. Moore swore in the following witnesses: Yogesh Mistry, James Hill, Gary Dean, Elizabeth McKenzie, Scott Parker, Michael Sullivan and John Hansen.

James Hill stated that he is a professional engineer licensed in the State of New Jersey and New York. He has been licensed in New Jersey since 1985. He was an employee for Readington Township as Township Engineer.

Exhibit A-1 – Colored rendering of page 2 of the site plan dated 7/14/05 prepared by Thomas L. Yeager and Associates.

Mr. Hill testified that the existing conditions plan shows the property as it stands today which is primarily vegetative with a second growth forest. Coddington Road is to the left of the site or west side of the property. The railroad runs along the northern boundary of the property. On the east side of the property there are 2 commercial uses adjacent to the immediate property. Along the southern boundary line there is Tunis Cox Road where there are several residences that are adjacent to the property. Minalex Corporation is adjacent to the south and west of the immediate site. There is also an open field located on Block 38, lot 28 that extends back toward the main road where there is a home along Coddington Road. Along the west side of Coddington Road from the railroad tracks south there are several residential homes along that roadway. North of the tracks on the west side is Fimbel Door, and north of the track directly north of the property is a farm residence. After that there are woods and fields intermixed with wetlands north of the tracks to the north and east of the property. The wetland was mapped and submitted the information to the Department of Environmental Protection for a Letter of Interpretation. That information has been received and is delineated on the map. It assigns a 150 foot buffer to the edge of the wetlands. There is an unnamed tributary to Chambers Brook that comes up through the southeastern corner of the property to approximately the midway point and then there is a tributary that goes to the northwest and to the northeast. The northeast tributary follows the power line that traverses the property. On the site there are no improvements, except for the power line. On the northern edge of the property there is a 100 foot wide easement that is given to the New Jersey Water Authority which goes across the entire frontage (right-of-way) of the property, which extends approximately all the way from Whitehouse to Bound Brook as an easement.

Exhibit A-2 – Page 4 of the plans – grading utility stormwater management plan date 7/14/05.

Mr. Hill stated that this exhibit demonstrates how the project is laid out on what portion of the property and what the area of disturbance would be. The applicant proposes to construct a 2 story temple with approximately 29,900 square feet. The entrance would come in along the property frontage from Coddington Road to a parking lot that would service the number of people who would occupy the temple. According to Mr. Sullivan's report there is more than adequate parking for the use that we are proposing. The driveway would allow circulation to come in and drop off the congregants at the front plaza area and then the cars can pull around and park in parking spots that are located to the north and south of the area. There is a small area of approximately 10 parking spaces on the south side of the parking lot. The interior of the parking area is designed as a stormwater management area between infiltration and stormwater flow control it would take care of the parking lot itself and the paved area that lies in front of the temple. The

driveway is a 2 way driveway. The width is in accordance with the ordinance. They received fire code review on circulation through the parking lot, and have indicated that they are satisfied with the turns for the fire trucks. The applicant has applied for a buffer averaging which would allow them to bring the buffer in approximately 50 feet inside of its greatest point to allow the applicant to grade the stormwater swale down into the stormwater basin. The proposed septic system is currently before the Readington Township Board of Health. It will be designed to occupy an area of approximately 100 feet south of the temple along the property line between this site and the Minalex Corporation. The second part of the stormwater management system for the site would allow the rest of the flow that would come from the temple area down into a shallow basin located north of the power line easement that is located on the southern part of the property.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Richard Harris, 20 Coddington Road wanted to know where the entrance would be located. Mr. Hill answered where the temporary road is located. Mr. Harris also stated that the property was wet. Mr. Hill answered that all of this information has been sent into the State of New Jersey.

Debra Stoci, 11 Apple Tree Road, wanted to know how many parking spaces are proposed. Mr. Hill answered that they are required to have 55 parking spaces, although they have additional parking for the handicapped. There is 1 space for every 3 seats.

Patty Sellino, 29 Coddington Road wanted to know what the sticks in the ground meant. Mr. Hill stated that the environmentalist who measured the wetlands installed a flag with a number. That information was sent to the State.

Bill Begosh, Tunis Cox Road wanted to see the residences superimposed on this map for the next meeting. Mr. Hill answered that it is 240 feet from the nearest house. Mr. Begosh stated that Coddington Road does not look like that. Mr. Hill answered that this map was an accurate survey.

Mr. Barden, 9 Tunis Cox Road stated that he reviewed the plans and it did not look correct. He also wanted to know if the springs were found on the property. Mr. Hill stated that in preparation of the maps there is a combination a digital aerial photography and then you survey areas in to make sure that the information is correct. The topography was prepared by Reynolds Group. Mr. Hill will ask what they found on this gentlemen's property.

Amy Broidrick, 9 Tunis Cox Road stated that it looks like only one surveyor looked at this. Mr. Hill asked if he could have access to the property and she agreed.

John Petrakis, 8 Tunis Cox Road wanted to know if the septic system was designed and approved and where is it located. Mr. Hill stated that it is before the Board of Health. Mr. Hill answered that it will be located approximately 400 feet away from the property line at the southern end. He also welcomed a surveyor to come onto his property to survey the property.

END OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Elizabeth C. McKenzie stated that she is a licensed professional planner in the State of New Jersey. Her office is located at 9 Main Street, Flemington, New Jersey.

Ms. McKenzie testified that the Hindu religion is the oldest religion that exists. It is diverse as it is ancient. It is even more diverse in terms of the practices within Hinduism as Christianity in terms of the various denominations. Hindus practice their religion by worshipping specific gods. There are different gods in different temples. This particular temple has been founded on the basis of replicating 4 temples that exist in India and the deities that are worshipped within 4 temples. The temples are located in the north, south, east and west. The devotees will make pilgrimages to these temples. This particular temple is being founded by 30 to 40 devotees that are looking to build this temple in the way they choose to worship. They expect that after it is built they may have 20 or more devotees so initially they may have 60 people. The building is being designed to accommodate 150 people at a time. The people who will attend this facility already worship at other temples, but the location is not convenient for them. The fact that there are other temples closer to them does not necessarily satisfy their need to practice their religion in their particular way. This facility would be centrally located; it has good access to the north, west, east and south. One of the tenants of Hinduism is freedom of religion and freedom to worship the gods of their choice. This would fulfill the needs to a particular group. There is an increase in the Asian population in Hunterdon and Somerset County. Ms. McKenzie stated that there will be more information in the upcoming meetings. This was an overview of the reason the proposed facility is sought.

Mr. Moore asked if there were any members of the church that could verify what she testified to this evening. Ms. McKenzie stated that her client has given her the information that she has in turn relayed to the board. Her client would prefer not to be a witness.

Mrs. Fort wanted to know in what direction most of the devotees would be coming from. Ms. McKenzie answered Somerset, Morris and Middlesex County.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Harry Nijenhuis, Coddington Road wanted to know how many times a day and how many times a week will the congregants come to the temple. Ms. McKenzie answered that the worship services are held on Sundays.

Catherine Petrakis, Tunis Cox Road wanted to know if the temple would be used at any other time for services. Ms. McKenzie stated that she will be getting into that subject as part of her more extensive testimony.

Savita Saini, 6 Tunis Cox Road wanted to know how many of the founding members live in the township. Ms. McKenzie did not know the answer.

Patty Sellino, 29 Coddington Road wanted to know if the person representing the temple live in the township. Ms. McKenzie stated that he has a Readington address, but she believes he lives at Edison.

James Lammens, 11 Apple Tree Road wanted to know why this has to be built in a residential area. Ms. McKenzie answered that this is a site that is zoned industrially, even though there are residential zones surrounding it. Incidentally, in the Residential zone in Readington, houses of worship are permitted.

Charlotte Lacroix, Coddington Road wanted if this temple would appeal to more diverse population. Ms. McKenzie answered that the people that are interested in worshipping these particular deities in these 4 temples would be more limited than the people would be interested in other deities.

John Petrakis, 8 Tunis Cox Road wanted to know if the applicant had a good grasp of the English language. Ms. McKenzie answered no.

Ms. Broidrick, 9 Tunis Cox Road wanted to know if 150 people are realistic. Ms. McKenzie stated that there will be testimony in the future.

Mr. Barden, 9 Tunis Cox Road would it be possible to get information as far as where is the closest temple like this located. Ms. McKenzie answered that this information will be provided in the future.

This matter was carried to March 16, 2006.

G. ADJOURNMENT:

Ms. Hendry made a motion to adjourn. Mrs. Flynn seconded the motion. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, nays none recorded.*

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz