

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
February 17, 2005**

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.

A.

Mrs. Fort	present
Mrs. Flynn	present
Mrs. Goodwin	present
Ms. Hendry	present
Mr. Felicetta	present
Mr. Shepherd	absent
Mr. Staats	present
Mr. Thompson	present
Mr. Denning	absent

**Michael Sullivan, Clarke Caton & Hintz
John Hansen, Ferriero Engineering
Mary Paist-Goldman, Princeton Hydro
Donald Moore, Esq.
Scott Parker, P.E., Edwards & Kelcey**

B. 1. Swearing-In of New Board Members

Attorney Moore stated on the record that the new Board members were sworn in prior to the meeting.

Members that were sworn in:

Pat Felicetta 2nd. Alternate – One year
Meredith Goodwin – Four years

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. January 20, 2005

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

2. Executive Minutes January 20, 2005

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

D. CORRESPONDENCE:

The secretary read the correspondence into the record. The board received a letter from Lloyd Tubman, Esq., regarding the Krew Car Wash. The letter explained that the applicant proposed to amend their sign. They are requesting a waiver from the Technical Review Committee review and also requested to be listed on the next Board of Adjustment agenda. Since there is no checklist for an amended final site plan, the board agreed to the request.

Ms. Hendry made a motion to allow the applicant Krew Car Wash to waive the Technical Review Committee's review and proceed directly to the board. Mrs. Flynn seconded the motion. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, nays none recorded*

E. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Attorney Moore read the following resolution into the record:

RESOLUTION

(Open Public Meetings Act – Executive Session)

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 2:4-12, Open Public Meetings Act, permits the exclusion of the public from a meeting in certain circumstances; and

WHEREAS, this public body is of the opinion that such circumstances presently exist:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Adjustment, of the Township of Readington, County of Hunterdon, State of New Jersey, as follows:

1. The public shall be excluded from discussion of the hereinafter specified subject matters.
2. The general nature of the subject matter to be discussed is as follows:
Active litigation and subject to attorney/client privilege. - **Whitehouse First Aid & Rescue Squad v. Readington Township Board of Adjustment.**
3. It is anticipated at this time that the above matter will remain confidential because litigation remains pending.
4. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

Certified to be a true copy of a Resolution adopted on February 17, 2005.

Ms. Goodwin made a motion to go into closed session. Mrs. Flynn seconded the motion. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, nays none recorded.*

Mr. Staats made a motion to open the public hearing. Ms. Hendry seconded the motion. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, nays none recorded.*

F. OLD BUSINESS:

- 1. Whitehouse United Methodist Church
Block 13, lots 34.01 & 36
Extension of time to file deeds**

Mrs. Flynn made a motion to approve the resolution to extend approval to April 21, 2005. Mrs. Goodwin seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Mrs. Flynn	aye
Mrs. Goodwin	aye
Ms. Hendry	aye
Mr. Felicetta	aye
Mr. Staats	aye
Mr. Thompson	aye
Madam Chair	aye

G. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

- 1. Laurence & Janice Hoffman
Block 9, lot 6
Variance application
Action date: March 6, 2005**

Mr. Boak attorney for the applicant appeared before the Board. Mr. Sullivan stated that there were 2 elements regarding the stream corridor ordinance checklist that still have not been met, namely; the limited disturbance and showing the soil erosion measures. Based upon the fact that this information must be provided, the TRC recommended that this matter be deemed incomplete.

- 2. Our Lady Of Lourdes Church**

**Block 28, lot 10
Preliminary Major Site Plan
Action date: March 10, 2005**

Mr. Staats stated that there were outstanding issues and therefore the Technical Review Committee recommended that this application be deemed incomplete.

- 3. CVS
Final Major Site Plan
Route 202 & Summer Rd.
Block 95, Lots 16 & 17.01
Action date: March 10, 2005**

Mr. Staats stated that the TRC recommended that the application be deemed complete.

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

H. RESOLUTIONS:

- 1. Professional Contracts**

Mrs. Flynn made a motion to approve the motion. Mrs. Goodwin seconded the motion.

Mrs. Flynn	aye
Mrs. Goodwin	aye
Ms. Hendry	aye
Mr. Felicetta	aye
Mr. Staats	aye
Mr. Thompson	aye
Madam Chair	aye

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. Hunterdon Christian Church
Block 94, lot 1.203
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan
signed extension to February 17, 2005**

Mr. Koester stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. He informed the board that this is a continued hearing. The applicant met with the board's professionals prior to the hearing.

Mr. Moore swore in the witness.

Deanna Drumm stated that she is a traffic expert. She addressed Scott Parker's letter. Ms. Drumm informed the board that the definition of trip generation is the amount of trips that the proposed development will generate. The standards that she used were from the Institute Transportation Engineers; however studies for churches are limited. In this case they collected traffic volumes at the existing church on a Sunday. There were 2 services, at 9:15 a.m. and 11:15 a.m. approximately. Based upon the amount of attendees for each of the services they found approximately 2 1/2 people per car. There was an issue regarding the Automatic Traffic Recorder ATR.

Ms. Drumm stated that based upon the information that the church provided, the existing attendance is approximately 80%.

Mrs. Flynn wanted to know if the ball field occupancy was taken into account when this analysis was performed. Ms. Drumm answered no. The data was collected in November on a Sunday. They also collected data in 2001. The data was collected from 8:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. Ms. Drumm testified that the information that she received from the church is that after the expansion is complete, they will have 250 seats. They are projecting a few hundred people per service.

Ms. Flynn wanted to know what the increase was regarding the traffic analysis between 2001 and 2003. Ms. Drumm answered in 2001 between the hours and 10:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. there were approximately 56 vehicles exiting the site. In 2003 between 10:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. there were approximately 64 vehicles exiting the site.

Mrs. Fort wanted to know if the applicant had taken into consideration the traffic that will be generated from the newly approved applications in the area. Ms. Drumm answered yes. They used an annual growth rate to determine the increase.

Ms. Drumm testified that the last item that Edwards & Kelcey addressed in their report was the parking. It was her understanding that they are proposing 98 parking spaces and they are required to have 83 parking spaces. In her traffic data collection in 2003, they would periodically count the number of cars in the parking lot. Based upon those numbers, they were able to determine what the peak parking lot was for the first service as well as the second service. The church did supply the amount of attendees that were present at both of the services. Based upon that information, she was able to calculate a ratio per attendees. That gave her the number of 95 parking spaces in the future. She also referred to the Institute of

Transportation and Engineers Parking Generation for more information. This data recommended 90 spaces for the anticipated attendees.

Ms. Hendry stated that given the testimony that the board had received, nuclear families are not necessarily driving one vehicle to church. She asked if that were to happen for a significant number of families, would that change her estimate. Ms. Drumm answered no.

Scott Parker of Edwards and Kelcey informed the board that traffic operations during a normal Sunday service are typically very good in this location. He stated that you can absorb a fair number of additional vehicles during those peak periods without seeing a lot of adverse affects. There were comments regarding the 4 vehicles per family. Mr. Parker did not feel that this would apply to the majority of the families. The intent of Edwards & Kelcey's request to install an ATR in the driveway was to develop one data set that would allow the board to have extract numbers. Mr. Parker also confirmed that the 80% attendance rate calculated to be 2.5 persons per car. He testified that if you take the 250 seats for the proposed expansion and take the 80% attendance, it gives you 200 congregants per service, and it is in line with the ordinance that requires 83 parking spaces to be provided.

Mrs. Fort stated that possibly the parking should be a phased issue.

Mr. Hansen stated that the stormwater management was designed to handle the increase in parking.

Mr. Moore was interested in the 4th item in Mr. Parker's report. His interpretation of that section was that it was not essential to do any traffic studies around the intersection of Route 202 and Summer Road. Mr. Parker answered that the eastbound approach and the northbound left turn would be the 2 critical movements. The CVS Pharmacy will not have any affect on those 2 movements. He stated that the comment in his report was based upon not really knowing where the applicant was going with the computations and how the trip generation characteristics and demands would play out. He is comfortable with the testimony that he heard at this meeting. Comment 4 of his report becomes moot at this point.

Mrs. Flynn asked Mr. Parker if the spring and fall soccer and baseball games would have an impact on the traffic. Mr. Parker answered that there would be some interplay of traffic during that time. But this activity is spread throughout the day.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Cannarella remained under oath from the last meeting. He addressed Mr. Hansen's report. A meeting had taken place prior to the hearing and most of the

items in his report have been worked out. Regarding page 2 of Mr. Hansen's report dated November 15, 2004, the applicant was asked to provide drainage calculations for the old pipe that is located downstream and would eventually hook up into the detention basin. Mr. Hansen stated that if the pipe runs down into the inlet, some of the trees and tree roots and possibly the slope would have to be removed. Mr. Hansen requested that Mr. Cannarella should go to the site and look at both sides of the street to determine if they might be able to cross the road and go down to an inlet located further west of the site. Some of the trees could be saved and it would be a more appropriate location to place the storm system. Mr. Cannarella informed the board that the trees alongside the road are in the right-of-way, so therefore do not belong to a private person.

Ms. Hendry stated that she is in favor of saving the trees and installing the pipe according to where the road lies now and not widening the road.

Exhibits:

A-4 through A-7 Photograph of Summer Road taken by Mr. Cannarella on this date.

Mrs. Goodwin stated that regarding the tree removal, this should be left up to the professionals to determine what is appropriate. She did not want to belabor the board by picking and choosing what trees should be taken. The board agreed with her recommendation.

Mr. Hansen testified that the only road widening that would be required would be in front of the applicant's property. He stated that he had had some discussion with the township engineer about widening this road. A letter was forwarded to the Township Committee inquiring if they would be interested in developing a uniform policy for roads.

Mr. Cannarella addressed Mr. Hansen's report again wherein they requested waivers for the curbing around some of the perimeter of the parking and the light height and light spacing. He stated that it is his understanding that both professionals, Mr. Hansen and Mr. Sullivan, had agreed to those waiver requests.

Regarding Princeton Hydro's report dated November 17, 2004, Mr. Cannarella stated the applicant would comply with numbers 4 through 7. Regarding items #2 and 3, the applicant had performed extensive soil testing last week. They did not have all of the design for the detention basin and the infiltration basin at the time of the use variance approval, but now they have the exact information. That information will be incorporated in the revised set of drawings.

Mary Paist-Goldman of Princeton Hydro wanted to point out item number 6 of their report regarding the inspection and maintenance management that this should be a separate document from the plan set for ease of keeping this on site after the

stormwater features are constructed. Mr. Cannarella stated that they would comply with this request.

The applicant's attorney signed an extension of time to March 17, 2005. The hearing will be carried to that date without further notice to the public.

The board took a 10 minute break.

2. Yardville National Bank
Block 5, lot 6
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan
signed extension to February 17, 2005

Geoffrey Soriano stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. He stated that this is a continued hearing. At the prior hearing they presented testimony of David Stires who is the project engineer.

Mr. Moore swore in the witness.

Ezio Columbro stated that he is a registered architect in the State of New Jersey. He was licensed in 1990. He is graduate of the New Jersey Institute of Technology.

Exhibit:

A-2 One drawing illustrating all 4 elevations of the building, dated 6/16/04 authored by Ezio Columbro.

Mr. Columbro stated that the board has a copy of this plan. The front elevation is facing Route 22 which is the south elevation. The north elevation is facing the residential district to the rear. The drive-thru would be the west elevation and the east elevation fronts Ramsey Road. The building has a gable roof running north to south. The height is 28 feet.

Regarding Mr. Sullivan's report dated November 11, 2004, there was a general comment on §8.5 as to the design being compatible with the surrounding residential complex. Mr. Columbro stated that the building is compatible to the surrounding homes.

Mrs. Goodwin stated that this is a very attractive building.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Paul Weigand stated that he is concerned about leaving the vegetation in its current state. He stated that the condition of the vegetation is poor. It should be thinned out and replanted.

Mr. Soriano stated that the landscape architect will address this matter.

Mr. Moore swore in the witness.

David Chewey stated that he is a graduate from Rutgers University with a degree in landscape architecture and certified in 1996 in New Jersey.

A-3 Landscape plan dated February 15, 2005

Mr. Chewey testified that currently at the back of the property there is a very large area of existing vegetation in the form of shrubs and also some evergreens and shade trees. The applicant is proposing to plant a dense planting of evergreens throughout the entire perimeter of the back of the property.

Mr. Sullivan wanted to know what the applicant proposed to plant in the area in the back between the parking lot on the north side and the north side of the site.

Mr. Chewey answered that this is still up for discussion.

Mr. Soriano requested that the board relax the requirement for shade trees along Route 22.

John Hansen testified that the applicant proposes an underground pipe to handle the stormwater flow coming off of the site. To meet the ordinance, however, they would have to install some type of basin or a treatment device that would be located under the pavement. Mr. Soriano informed the board that they initially met with the planner during the pre-application phase and they proposed a detention area in the front but were told that that would not be appropriate.

Ms. Hendry stated that the applicant needs to make a decision as to what type of treatment device they propose to install and then come back and present it to the board.

Mr. Soriano stated that the applicant would prefer not to change the underground system.

Mr. Staats wanted to know if he was traveling in a north or south direction on the highway, would he be able to see lights from the building. Mr. Chewey answered that this would have to be referred to the engineer. The proposed buffering would defuse some of the lights. A fence is also proposed along the property line.

Mr. Soriano distributed copies of Elizabeth McKenzie's testimony to the board.

Mr. Soriano signed an extension on behalf of this client to March 17, 2005.

J. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz