

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
June 21, 2007**

Chairperson Fort called the meeting to order at 7:43 p.m. announcing that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act had been met and that the meeting had been duly advertised. Attorney Moore swore in second alternate member Keith Hendrickson prior to the meeting beginning.

A.

Mrs. Fort	present
Mrs. Flynn	present
Mrs. Goodwin	present
Ms. Hendry	absent
Keith Hendrickson	present
Mr. Stettner	present
Mr. Shepherd	absent
Mr. Thompson	present
Mr. Denning	absent

Donald Moore, Esq., Kelleher & Moore
John Hansen, Ferriero Engineering
Brent Krasner, Clark*Catton*Hintz
Scott Parker, Edwards & Kelcey

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. May 17, 2007

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

C. CORRESPONDENCE:

The board recognized that the Serra application Block 36, lot 96 and the Quinn application Block 1, lot 37.01 were withdrawn.

D. RESOLUTIONS:

- Hunterdon Christian Church
Block 94, lot 12.03
Request for extension to approval**

Mrs. Flynn made a motion to approve this resolution. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Mrs. Flynn aye
Mr. Stettner aye
Mr. Thompson aye
Madam Chair aye

2. **Francis P Ciccarino**
 Karen I. Hiller Ciccarino
 Block 66, lot 19.20
 Variance

Mrs. Flynn made a motion to approve this resolution. Mr. Stettner seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Mrs. Flynn aye
Mr. Stettner aye
Mr. Thompson aye
Madam Chair aye

E VOUCHER APPROVAL:

 Mrs. Goodwin made a motion to approve the vouchers as submitted. Mrs. Flynn seconded the motion. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, nays none recorded.*

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless**
 Block 17, Lot 9
 384 Route 22,
 Variance
 Action date: July 13, 2007

 Richard Schneider, Esq., of Vogel, Chait, Collins & Schneider stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. The applicant is seeking approval to co-locate a wireless communication facility on the existing communications flag pole that is located at Block 17, lot 9. The applicant proposes to install its antennae array at 86 feet on the 100 foot flag pole. They propose no extension to the flag pole. All of the antennas will be located in the interior of the flag pole. The compound will be expanded in order to accommodate the applicant's equipment.

Attorney Moore swore in the board's professionals and Richard Conroy.

Mr. Conroy stated his qualifications for the board. He is a senior radio frequency engineer consultant.

Mr. Conroy testified that Verizon Wireless is one of the wireless communications that is licensed to provide service to this area.

Exhibit A-1 Verizon Wireless proposed Whitehouse Station -coverage propagation overlay dated June 21, 2007.

The underlying map to Exhibit A-1 is a map of the area viewing the subject property and surrounding environment.

Mr. Conroy informed the board that the first overlay represents the coverage from Verizon Wireless's system from the existing facilities. The gap is specifically 3.25 miles along Route 22 and 1 ½ miles along Route 523. The proposed installation of the antennas at this site would fill the gap in coverage area. Mr. Conroy stated that they would be able to operate in this flag pole without interfering with the existing antennas array of Sprint Spectrum.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no comments from the public.

Christopher Nevill was sworn. He stated that he is a licensed professional engineer and professional planner. In conjunction with the preparation of the site plan, he testified that he is familiar with the township's ordinances. He stated that a similar application had been filed by Cingular Wireless.

Exhibit A-2 Site plan (SP-1) prepared by Christopher Nevill dated January 23, 2007

Mr. Nevill described the site conditions to the board. The Sprint installation is located to the northwesterly side of the parking lot. The property does not comply with the township's impervious coverage requirements. The applicant will increase the impervious coverage by point three percent. Currently the Sprint compound exists on the property and is enclosed by an existing fence. The applicant is proposing to install 3 dual pole antennas. Since the existing flag pole has available space already, they will be installed within the flag pole and would be invisible.

Mr. Nevill stated that he has a set of photographs and one simulation picture. This exhibit depicts what is currently at the site and what the proposed antennae will portray.

Exhibit A-3 Photos and simulation for Block 17, lot 9 dated June 21, 2007

On the left hand side of the exhibit, the picture represents the existing facility. The equipment case is not visible from the view from Old Route 28. The flagpole is visible however. Regarding the view from eastbound Route 22, the vegetation and warehouse store blocks the view of the equipment. From the shopping centre plaza across Route 22, the flagpole is visible and the vegetation located in the middle of Route 22 blocks the view of the equipment cabinets. The final view at the bottom of the exhibit is a view from on-site of the

existing equipment compound and they have simulated the expansion of the equipment area for the applicant.

In Mr. Sullivan's report it is mentioned that there is an equipment shelter for another application that is still pending before the board. Mr. Schneider stated that he made an inquire with Cingular Wireless on this date and they have indicated that there has been no activity on this application since November 2006. This application was shown in terms of the site plan; there is now a question as to whether they will be proceeding with this application.

Mr. Hendrickson had a question as to whether or not the shrubbery in the median of Route 22 would block the view on the westbound side. Mr. Nevill answered that there is approximately 150 yards of area as you drive westbound on Route 22 where the motel and the other buildings might not block the view. But, he stated that where the compound is proposed to be located on the site, 60 to 70% along Route 22 is the parking lot for the motel. There are 2 trees that are located by the pool that are dead. The applicant is willing to replace these trees. The compound area will have to be expanded by approximately 15 feet towards the rear of the property and a width of 24 ½ feet. The height of the equipment shelter inclusive of the canopy extension measures 10 feet 3 inches and by virtue of the township's ordinance only 10 feet is allowed. Mr. Nevill testified that during the Sprint application, they were required and did plant a substantial amount of landscaping so there is quite a heavy vegetative buffer at the rear of the property that blocks the view from the residences. The applicant will match the fence that already exists at the site. The sites are visited only once every four to six weeks for routine maintenance. In Mr. Nevill's professional planner's opinion, he felt that the site could accommodate the applicant's deviations.

Mrs. Goodwin wanted to know how close the nearest residence was to this facility. Mr. Nevill answered that it is approximately 230 feet.

The size of the enclosed area is 24 ½ feet in width and 15 feet in depth which is shown on exhibit A-4.

Mrs. Goodwin asked if they were proposing to use fans to cool the equipment at the facility. Mr. Nevill answered that they will have fans installed for cooling that are similar to the Sprint's cabinets. The sound from Route 22 eradicates the sound of the fans.

Mrs. Fort supports the co-location application in terms of the visibility on the tower. She is not pleased by the view of the equipment complex from Route 22. She asked if he had any ideas to shield the cabinets from sight. Mr. Nevill answered that the only area to add additional plantings would be at the small island of land in the front of the building. The landlord however is also concerned because his business is being screened. Therefore, they could concentrate on the compound area. They could install a board on board fence.

Mr. Schneider stated that the applicant would be willing to replace the existing fence. The planner's office would review the fence proposal. The board suggested a white vinyl fence.

Michael Fischer was sworn by Mr. Moore. He stated that he is a wireless consultant with the firm of Lenium Engineering. He stated that his specialty is radio frequency emission

compliance. He confirmed that the level of radio frequency emissions is in strict compliance with FCC standards. He used the FCC methodology when preparing his report dated November 22, 2006. The report was submitted to the board. The purpose of the report was to confirm whether the applicant's facility is in strict compliance with FCC standards. He also accounted for the radio frequency emissions for Sprint Spectrum facility. He concluded that the radio frequency emissions are in strict compliance with applicable FCC regulations. The radio frequency emissions were below one percent of the allowed amount.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no comments from the public.

Marygrace Flynn made a motion to approve the application with the condition regarding the fence replacement, inspect and replace dead trees at the site and note on the plan subject to the planner's review and the conditions of Mr. Hansen's letter June 20, 2007. Mrs. Goodwin seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Flynn	aye
Mrs. Goodwin	aye
Mr. Hendrickson	aye
Mr. Stettner	aye
Mr. Thompson	aye
Madam Chair	aye

Mr. Moore stated for the record that a neighbor had made a complaint to the Planning/Zoning Office regarding this application. The issue that was raised was the radio frequency impact on individuals. There is also a threat that if this was approved, he would sue the board members individually. If this would occur, Mr. Moore stated that he should be contacted immediately. The person from the public requested, but was not given, the names and home addresses and telephone numbers of the board members.

The board took a recess.

2. CharDham Hindu Temple/Readington
Use Variance & Preliminary Site Plan
25A Coddington Road
Action date: June 21, 2007

Lloyd Tubman, Esq., stated for the record that she is from the firm of Archer & Greiner and that she represents the applicant. She stated that this is a continuation of a public hearing.

Gary Dean and the board's professionals were sworn.

Mr. Dean testified that his professional address 142 Oldwick, Oldwick, New Jersey. He graduated in 1983 from Lehigh University with a Bachelor of Science degree in civil

engineering. He has been involved in traffic engineering since 1983 and is a licensed civil engineer in the State of New Jersey since 1987.

Mr. Dean testified that he performed the original traffic analysis in July 2005. The traffic data for that report was collected in May, 2005. On June 7, 2007, he submitted a letter to the board. That letter sets forth the findings of new traffic counts that were performed along Coddington Road, just north of the railroad tracks. Additionally, he had employees take another count on Sunday in the early afternoon to manually count traffic along Route 22 turning in both directions and making the U-Turn at Coddington Road and in addition exiting Coddington Road. This report confirms the findings that was generated 2 years ago that the volume has not changed. He detailed how the traffic analysis was performed. On Sunday mornings there is the least amount of traffic on Route 22. It was his conclusion that the intersection was operating at a favorable service level. At Pulaski Road they concluded that there were no problems. They additionally estimated how much traffic would be generated by the temple. He examined several different ways to project traffic depending upon the house of worship. Traffic engineers use projections that have been compiled in a publication entitled "Trip Generation" by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. There are only 2 land use categories that fit a house of worship. One is a synagogue and the second is a traditional church. In his reports, he compared both estimates for a 150 seat facility. He used the traditional church trip generation which was appropriate to make his analysis. He estimated that there would be 50 arrival vehicles prior to the start of the service and approximately the same existing at the conclusion of the service. They also looked at 2 different time periods when traffic would be moving along Coddington Road and Route 22 associated with the temple. At first, they have the arrival peak hours prior to the start of services. This was estimated to be between 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 a. m. in the morning. At approximately 11:00 p.m., they would then have a dismissal peak hour. On their projections, they estimated that they would have 50 arrival vehicles and 5 exiting vehicles during the arrival from between 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Dean testified that based upon the current zoning on this property, the traffic associated with uses permitted by right, would be higher in total volume and would be higher at peak hours times and would generate more traffic on a weekday basis. He stated that uses that generate less traffic than what is permitted by right advance one of the purposes of zoning through the development of lands that do not result in undue traffic congestion. His analysis considered anticipated future growth within the community. They have applied a background growth factor expecting that volumes will go up over the course of time. Mr. Dean stated that his most recent analysis in June he investigated another potential in terms of traffic generation. In their latest traffic report basically said that whatever they found in the year 2005 based upon a parking lot size of 55 parking spaces, they doubled their traffic projections. They have found that it does not have any bearing on the overall traffic conditions. The levels of service will remain the same. They prepared what is called a sensitivity analysis. The roadway system can readily accept that traffic.

Pursuant to the report created by the Readington Township Police, there was a recommendation to create a one way traffic flow.

Marygrace Flynn asked if there would be a problem with cars making the U-Turn on Coddington Road and would there be stacking on Route 22 during the peak hours. Mr. Dean answered that with all of the median openings that exist in this community, this is

always a challenge. He did not anticipate it to be more of a problem than at 5:00 p.m. on a weekday.

Mrs. Fort asked if the railroad lines ran on Sunday. Mr. Dean answered no. The line on Sunday stops at Raritan Borough.

Mr. Parker requested clarification. He understood the testimony to be that there would be 15 vehicles per hour south of the site. Mr. Dean stated that he made a mistake. He stated that it should be 30 vehicles.

Mr. Parker had a question concerning the trip generation projections that was conducted and if the defining point was to the amount of people that would be going in and out of the site. Mr. Dean answered yes. Mr. Parker stated that the board has a problem, with the "what if" scenario. If the temple at some point was converted to some other faith church the building is approximately 29,000 square feet and on two levels you could assume that only one of the levels would be used for a service, so the number would be 14,000. He wanted to know how many congregants could fit in a 14,000 square foot facility. Mr. Dean answered that he used the Calvary Bible Church as a comparison and that they could probably fit 400 people in that size building.

Mr. Parker stated that a typical house of worship the number that he has seen used per vehicle would be 2.5. He has seen the number 3 used too. Mr. Parker indicated that he is not too uncomfortable with the number 3 in the analysis. The document that was provided on June 7, 2007 the HCS Highway Software Capacity Printouts were included in the document. The peak hour factor that is incorporated in this analysis is point nine five which is the software's default value for the lack of having the information. In looking at the field sheets for the actual count data the peak hour factors for the eastbound and westbound movement on Route 22 are more on the order of point eight which would have some significant bearing on the results of that analysis. He was not sure that it would change the level of service without running his own analysis. He suggested that another run should be taken to see what implication that peak hour factor has on this analysis. One other matter Mr. Parker stated that there was a delineation of the number of trucks that were in the traffic stream. The analysis did not incorporate a heavy vehicle percentage. He recommended that another run be performed at the Route 22 intersection. He is not that concerned with the Coddington and Pulaski intersection because this is a low volume at an unsignalized location. He is concerned with the Route 22 and the uncontrolled median opening. The State does not care for the uncontrolled median openings. But a deceleration lane could be installed on the wide grass median area so at least if there is a stacking issue vehicles would have a place to stack outside of live lanes. Depending upon what the revised analysis would indicate bears whether or not this would be an issue.

Mrs. Goodwin made a suggestion to direct traffic when they are exiting the site they could only exit on to Route 22.

Mr. Parker replied that this is a difficult question to answer. He would have to give it some thought. He informed everyone that by trying to solve one problem, you might be re-locating the problem.

Mrs. Fort asked if Mr. Parker had any comments on the nature of Coddington Road and the limitations connected to it. Mr. Parker answered that it is a very typical road found within the township. South of the railroad tracks it is approximately a 24 foot cart way. This is adequate for 2 directional traffic, but not a high speed road. This does place limitations on high much additional traffic you want to encourage on that road and more particularly whether or not you want people stopping on that road. Parking along the roadway would not be a suitable alternative.

Mrs. Goodwin stated that people should not park along Tunis Cox either. There are no sidewalks.

Brent Krasner had no comments regarding traffic.

John Hansen stated that if it turns out that the board determines that there is some need for improvements to Coddington Road or the intersections he would review the off track improvement ordinance. The applicant would then be responsible for their pro rata share.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Michele Jaunarajs – 101 Pulaski Road – She wanted to know if Mr. Dean took into account the traffic on the Pulaski Road, Coddington Road intersection on Sunday mornings when another church, Our Lady of Lourdes, has exit and entrance times similar to the temple.

Mr. Dean answered that he did study the intersection of Coddington Road and Pulaski Road. This was included in the background traffic analysis.

Ms. Jaunarajs wanted to know if there are any standards in place for the number of feet between her car and the curvature in the road before there would be something significant, for example railroad track or driveway.

Mr. Dean answered that there are standards for site distances.

Michael Renda wanted to know what the purpose of conducting a traffic count was. Mr. Dean answered it was to measure the existing traffic activity on the roadway system which serves a basis to identify whether the level of impact attributed to the increase related to the temple will prove problematic.

Mr. Renda stated that the traffic study was performed by the number of congregants that was given to Mr. Dean by the applicant. Mr. Dean answered that the traffic projections was based upon the number of participants anticipating some sustained level of future growth. There are 67 members currently and his projection is based upon more than doubling that membership for some future date.

Amy Broidrick 9 Tunis Cox Road – She wanted to know how Mr. Dean concluded that the temple would only be used one hour per week on Sunday. Also, could he compare this to other temples in the State of New Jersey?

Mr. Dean answered that he can't answer the second part of her question. All temples, like any other house of worship, are different. In terms of the testimony that the temple would

be used for only one hour, he stated that was not his testimony. He stated that he looked at the peak hours of traffic between 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. because this is the time when people would arrive. The services will range from one to two hours, but then at the conclusion of the services people would leave. This period is when traffic associated with the temple would be the busiest. If the temple is used during the week, there could be 2 or 3 cars an hour, and in his opinion this would not warrant a traffic study.

Savita Saini – Tunis Cox Road – She wanted to make sure that Mr. Dean knew that at a prior meeting, it was stated that the temple would have 4 festivals. Mr. Dean was not aware of that. Mrs. Tubman stated that this is a topic that Mr. Bhatt would have to clarify this information.

Mrs. Goodwin was concerned that if there were satellite parking, would there be any problems with a turning radius for buses. Mr. Dean answered that the site has been designed to accommodate fire apparatus, therefore a bus would fit on the property.

Rakesh Saini – 6 Tunis Cox Road – He wanted to know at what number would there be a traffic problem at this site. Mr. Dean answered that the applicant has 67 members today. If this temple would open in the next few years, this number is the basis for the membership. His analysis has taken this number to the next step which is 300. All of the projections have shown him that that flow can be carried with no problem. He has not prepared an analysis of when the system would break.

Additionally, Mr. Saini wanted to know where the overflow parking park would be located. Mr. Dean stated that they are not expecting to have overflow parking, it is against the law.

Charlotte Nijenhuis 24 Coddington Road – She wanted to know if Mr. Dean looked at the traffic flow that goes from Route 523 to Pulaski Road and up Coddington Road to go to Route 22 so that they can avoid going through the lights and traffic. Mr. Dean answered that he is unaware of any such problems with the traffic traveling these routes early Sunday morning.

Ms. Nijenhuis also wanted to know if Mr. Dean looked at the amount of accidents for that area. He answered yes.

Andrew Kokinda – 5 Tunis Cox Road – He wanted to know if it would be a traffic hazard to have cars queued on Coddington Road going north and south waiting to turn into the CharDham parking lot. Mr. Dean answered that it is not a hazard.

Vince Renda 9 Farnell Lane – He wanted information regarding the visitors that attend the Bridgewater temple. Mr. Dean was unable to answer this question. Mr. Renda also requested that the board should be provided the difference between the number of visitors and the number of members.

Mrs. Fort indicated that the board has asked the same type of questions, however, the answer has been consistent that there would be no more than one hundred fifty people.

Fred Bardon – Tunis Cox Road – He wanted to know how many Sunday's did Mr. Dean perform the physical count. Mr. Dean answered 2 separate Sundays. Also, Mr. Barden

wanted to know if Mr. Dean performed an analysis of the line of site at the corner of Pulaski Road and Coddington Road. Mr. Dean answered no because he did not notice anything unusual or problematic. Mr. Bardon wanted to know if Mr. Dean measured the width of Coddington Road at the corner of Route 22. Mr. Dean answered no. Mr. Bardon answered that he measured it and it was 18'6" wide. He also wanted to know if Mr. Dean felt that this was a comfortable amount. Mr. Dean stated that it is designated and it functions as a two lane road.

Exhibit – Photograph A-44 taken by Mr. Dean’s staff in 2005 indicating the northbound direction at Coddington Road.

Michele Jaunaraajs – 101 Pulaski Road – wanted to know the number of accidents that occur at the cut over where Walmart is located and versus the less used cut overs to the east and the west. Mr. Dean stated that he did not look at that data and would have no comment.

Madam Chair announced that the hearing would be continued to the July 19, 2007 meeting with no further notice to the public.

G. ADJOURNMENT:

A Motion was made by Mrs. Flynn to adjourn the meeting at 10:51 p.m. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Jacukowicz