

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
May 19, 2005**

Chairperson Fort called the meeting to order at 7:30 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	absent
Mrs. Goodwin	present
Ms. Hendry	present
Mr. Felicetta	present - arrived at 7:40 p.m.
Mr. Shepherd	present - arrived at 7:45 p.m.
Mr. Staats	present
Mr. Thompson	present - arrived at 7:40 p.m.
Mr. Denning	present

**Michael Sullivan, Clarke Caton & Hintz
John Hansen, Ferriero Engineering
Donald Moore, Esq.
Geoffrey Goll, Princeton Hydro
Scott Parker, Edwards & Kelcey**

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. April 21, 2005

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.

D. RESOLUTIONS:

**1. Yardville National Bank
Block 5, lot 6**

Preliminary Major Site Plan

Mr. Denning made a motion to approve the resolution. Mrs. Goodwin seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Mr. Denning	aye
Mrs. Goodwin	aye
Ms. Hendry	aye
Mr. Thompson	aye
Mrs. Fort	aye

**2. Commerce Bank
Block 19.01, lot 8
Final Major Site Plan**

Mr. Denning made a motion to approve the resolution. Mrs. Goodwin seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Mr. Denning	aye
Mrs. Goodwin	aye
Ms. Hendry	aye
Mr. Thompson	aye
Mrs. Fort	aye

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**1. Laurence & Janice Hoffman
Block 9, lot 6
Variance application
Action Date: August 19, 2005**

Robert Boak, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. The application proposed to raze the existing house and to construct a new house on the lot to replace it. The existing house is located close to Route 523. The lot does not meet the lot circle or the lot width as required by ordinance. Due to the existing buildings located on the lot, the garage will end up in the front yard as opposed to the back yard when the new home location is created to the rear of the property.

Janice Hoffman was sworn in by the attorney for the board. Ms. Hoffman stated that she has resided at this property for 46 years. The present house sits close to Route 523.

Exhibits:

A-1 Survey from Hunterdon County

Ms. Hoffman stated that she obtained the survey from the Hunterdon County Engineer's office. It shows the existing house and driveway. The road is going to be widened and they will take 25 feet of frontage. Currently the home is in need of repairs. They plan to erect a modular home in the back yard and then demolish the existing house. There are some out buildings that will have to be moved. Ms. Hoffman stated that she is unable to acquire additional land from either neighbor. They are currently hooked up to a well, but public water is available. They are hooked up to the public sewer. The home that they presently propose is 60 feet x 30 feet. They would need a larger building envelope than what is shown on their plan.

Mrs. Fort wanted to know what buildings would remain on the property. Ms. Hoffman answered the well house and the garage will remain. The building in front of the existing garage will be removed. The other shed that is located behind the garage is to be used as a dog house.

A-2 Survey prepared by Robert Lee Associates, dated 9/29/04.

A-3 Survey by John Keirney, dated 4/12/05

Mrs. Fort stated that the well house, the garage and the eastern most shed will remain. The western most shed and pond will be removed.

Ms. Hoffman also requested that her family be allowed to remain in their existing home while the new home is under construction and then demolish the older home once the new one is complete.

Mrs. Fort wanted to know what the process would be from moving one house to the other. Mrs. Hoffman there will not be 2 sets of appliances. Once the one house becomes usable, the other one will become unusable. The size of the new house has changed. It is now a 60 foot wide home. It is more handicapped accessible for her.

A-4 Revised house plans prepared by Castle Home dated 4/29/05

They are also proposing a 12' x 14' deck .

Mr. Moore stated that the survey should be revised to show the exact location of the new structure, with its dimensions and set backs, etc., and a listing of all the C variances.

Mr. Boak stated that the applicant would comply.

Mr. Staats requested that the applicant plant plantings in order to screen them from their southerly neighbors. The applicant agreed to that suggestion.

Mr. Denning wanted to know how long it would take to complete the project. Mrs. Hoffman answered that she was told it would take 4 months from beginning to end.

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

Geoff Goll of Princeton Hydro stated that the stream corridor buffer is to protect the existing vegetation and further degradation of the stream. There is still an expansive lawn that goes almost to the edge of the wetlands and the stream corridor. In this specific case, it does not really matter where the house is in relation to the stream because there is such an expansive lawn around it. The lawn is going to be treated. The runoff that is coming off of the roof of the house is going to be cleaner than what is coming off of the lawn.

Ms. Hendry stated that she does not have a problem with a corner of the house being located in the stream corridor.

Mr. Shepherd stated that the condition would be better than the existing condition as a result of allowing some minimal encroachment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no comments from the public.

Ms. Hendry made a motion to approve the application based upon the conditions that were set forth on the record. Mr. Denning seconded the motion.

Mr. Moore read the conditions into the record which were as follows: the open dog pen will be located near the further not removed shed and remain outside the stream corridor; the most westerly located shed will be removed and the well house and garage will stay; the structure itself will be expanded to 60' x 26'9" and will be relocated on the survey such that it does not extend any further than the extending proposed house into the flood corridor and that the expansion will be reflected by a southerly movement; before final approval that a copy of the plan must be submitted which includes the porch and deck; the temporary disturbance during construction is not to exceed 30' into the stream corridor; and the conditions set forth in John Hansen's letter must be met; after 3 months after the new house is constructed, the old house must be demolished; the variances should also be listed on the proposed plan.

Roll call:

Mr. Denning aye

Mrs. Goodwin	nay
Ms. Hendry	aye
Mr. Shepherd	aye
Mr. Thompson	aye
Mrs. Fort	aye

- 2. W. E. Timmerman & Co.
Final Major Site Plan
Block 15, lot 10
3554 Rt. 22 West
signed extension to May 19, 2005**

Anthony Koester, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. The applicant received preliminary and variance approval on September 16, 2004. Since that approval, they then moved to perfect the final site plan.

Ms. Hendry recused herself from this applicant since she was not eligible to vote on the preliminary and variance application.

James Matticola stated that he is the engineer for the applicant. The plans have been revised to address the comments from the board's professionals.

Exhibit:

- A-1 Latest plan dated 2/1/05**

The changes are as follows: the diesel fuel enclosure with the roof is shown on the plan; the masonry dumpster; they modified their drainage system, specifically their infiltration trench.

Regarding Mr. Hansen's letter dated April 19, 2005, the applicant has agreed to comply with all of his requests.

Regarding Mr. Sullivan's report dated March 7, 2005, the applicant stated under the site development issues, it was pointed out that there were still some open concerns. Under 4.1 in the report, on page 5 of 6, states that the board should determine the color type of siding. The applicant has determined to use the color green. Another matter was the roof over the diesel fuel storage area, that it should be a permanent nature. The board agreed that the siding color should be green. The applicant has agreed to comply with all of the conditions in his letter.

Mr. Staats made a motion to approve the final site plan. Mr. Felicetta seconded the motion.

Mr. Denning	aye
--------------------	------------

Mr. Felicetta	aye
Mrs. Goodwin	aye
Mr. Shepherd	aye
Mr. Staats	aye
Mr. Thompson	aye
Mrs. Fort	aye

The board took a 5 minute break

- 3. Hunterdon Christian Church
Block 94, lot 1.203
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan
Action date: signed extension to May 19, 2005**

Anthony Koester, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. He stated that this is the 3rd. hearing for this matter.

Exhibit:

A-8 Revised colorized plan identified as “Landscaping Plan” Sheet 8 dated 1/28/04 revised 4/28/05.

Mr. Thomas Cannarella stated in Mr. Sullivan’s letter section 4.1, he is requesting that the board approve the additional parking spaces.

Mr. Moore indicated to everyone that they are still under oath.

Mr. Parker addressed the 93 parking spaces issue that are required and the 98 that are proposed. He stated that there are some comparisons were done looking at the parking generations which would indicate that 90 spaces would be the typical average parking need for this type of church pursuant to the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation Handbook, Third Edition. The applicant could bank some of the parking. The question comes down as to when the banked parking space need would occur.

Deanna Drumm stated that she calculated it to be 94-95 spaces. She stated that they are within range of Mr. Parker.

Mr. Thompson wanted to know if the calculation that was used was based upon the usage of the current parking or the number of the cars on the lot or the number of members. Ms. Drumm answered that they use both. They look at the number of cars that are parked on the lot as well as using the attendance.

Mr. Thompson stated that there was prior testimony that some of the families bring 3 or 4 or more cars on a Sunday. Mr. Dressler made the observations during the course of the months on a Sunday to Sunday, service by service basis based upon

attendances. We found that we average 1.6 to 1.9 people per car. This is since May 1st

Mr. Moore stated that pursuant to the variance that was previously granted to the applicant, they can increase the FAR up to .10. This is a stage in that development. It doesn't reach that full development. In fact at this juncture, they are coming in for an 8,245 square feet increase which would bring the FAR up to .055. Which is well below what the ultimately could achieve if they are successful.

Mr. Koester stated that based upon the previous testimony of the church the 98 parking spaces will be needed and they do not want not to bank any.

Chairman Fort polled the board to see where they stood regarding the amount of the parking spaces.

Mr. Denning stated that the church will expand in the future. So whether the parking is installed now or in the future, they will need the space. He stated that he felt the extra parking capacity should be installed now so that there is not a shortage of parking capacity. He is not opposed to granting their request for the number of parking spaces.

Ms. Goodwin stated that she is not opposed to the amount of parking. She felt that 98 parking places made sense. She indicated that perhaps the congregation can car pool.

Mr. Staats stated that the applicant presented solid testimony regarding the parking spaces.

Ms. Hendry stated that she was not in favor of the additional number parking spaces. To have a fewer number of parking spaces might encourage members to be better stewards of the fuel shortage. She would have no objection on banking spaces should it be proven at a later date that they are needed.

Mr. Thompson stated that if the additional parking spaces are only 5 or 8 then it would be more cost effective to install them now.

Chairman Fort stated that 83 parking spaces are the minimum parking spaces for this application.

Mr. Shepherd stated that the impervious cover and FAR are already being increased beyond what is allowed. He is on the conservative end by granting more than what is presently needed based on assumption of future population growth.

Mr. Shepherd also wanted to know how many cars are in the parking lot on a Sunday. Mr. Cannarella answered approximately 70 to 85 cars.

Mr. Cannarella addressed the item pertaining to the buffer that was in Michael Sullivan's report. The buffer is located to the northwesterly sidelines and southwesterly sidelines. He stated that there is a 50 foot buffer that spans the entire property line. The buffer requires landscaping. However, with the intention of trying to preserve the existing trees, the applicant proposes to move the septic system further away from that line so there is no grading within 25 feet drip line of the trees. The applicant will grant a conservation easement to the rear line to preserve the existing trees.

Madam Chair stated the applicant should be explicit as to where the buffers are to be proposed so that the extent of the requested relief can be considered.

Mr. Sullivan asked the board should the buffer remain on the northwest buffer can the basin stay. Should the shade trees be located in the buffer? Should the shrub layer be planted? He wanted to know if the existing hedge row buffer was satisfactory.

Mr. Shepherd stated that the board has to determine if a variance is required for the septic system and retention period.

The applicant agreed to work with Mr. Sullivan regarding the landscaping issue.

Mr. Wayne Egolf, Project Architect stated that the elevations were revised. They propose to use a neutral color.

Mr. Cannarella stated that he would meet all of the items in John Hansen's report.

Mr. Koester recommended a condition of approval could be that they meet with Princeton Hydro's report.

Mr. Moore did not want the board to vote at this point.

Geoff Goll of Princeton Hydro testified that they are still sifting through the data and they have a lot of questions outstanding that need to be answered.

Mr. Koester signed an extension to June 16, 2005. There will be no further notice required to be given.

Mr. Moore requested that Mr. Koester prepare a summary of the waivers and variances that the applicant is requesting. Mr. Koester agreed.

F. OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Hionis Greenhouses

Mr. Moore stated that a letter had been sent to the Township Committee regarding the violations that are existing at the Hionis Greenhouses. The Township Committee granted Mr. Moore authority to act as deputy attorney for the township. Madam Chair and Mr. Moore will pursue an appeal to the County Board of Agriculture. Mr. Moore asked the members to take a look at the site at their convenience.

G. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz