

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
August 18, 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	present
Mrs. Goodwin	present
Ms. Hendry	present
Mr. Felicetta	absent
Mr. Shepherd	absent
Mr. Staats	present
Mr. Thompson	absent
Mr. Denning	present

Donald Moore, Esq., Kelleher & Moore
Kate Fullerton, Clarke Caton & Hintz
John Hansen, Ferriero Engineering
Donald Moore, Esq., Kelleher & Moore
Geoffrey Goll, Princeton Hydro

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. July 17, 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. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

**1. Omnipoint Communications, Inc.
Block 61, lot 5.02**

**Rt. 31 & Foothill Road
Preliminary Major Site Plan & Variance
Action date: August 29, 2005**

Mrs. Flynn stated that the Technical Review Committee recommended that the application be deemed incomplete. There are several outstanding items that still need to be submitted. Pursuant John Hansen's report dated August 18, 2005, the following waivers were recommended: beginning at page 2, #18 -Delineation of flood planes, floodway and flood fringe areas and slopes greater than 15%; and #24 Sight triangles.

Pursuant to Michael Sullivan's report dated August 15, 2005 the following waivers were recommended:

§5.2-2, page 12#'s 23, 41, 42 and 43. The TRC also recommends a waiver for §5.4, page 15#17.

Mr. Staats made a motion to grant the above mentioned waivers. Mrs. Flynn seconded the motion. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, one nay from Ms. Hendry recorded.*

Pursuant to Michael Sullivan's report dated August 15, 2005 the following should be submitted:

§4.8, page 6, #2 – The visual analysis submitted by the applicant does not address the potential visual impacts of the base of the tower. The visual analysis should be revised to address the distinction of the equipment and the need for screening.

§4.8, page 7, #3 – The application should prepare to address any potential impacts on viewscales, streetscapes and landscapes.

§5.2-2, page 12 #6 – Certification from tax collector that all taxes have been paid.

§5.4, page 14#10 – Mapping of flora & fauna habitats on, and within 200 feet of the area of disturbance.

§5.4, page 15#11 – The location of natural features such as wooded areas and rock formations within 200 feet of the area of disturbance.

§5.4, page 15#14 – Mapping of critical areas within 200 feet of the area of disturbance.

§5.4, page 15#15 – Mapping and description of streams on site within 200 feet of the area of disturbance.

§5.4, page 18, #44 – Analysis of the proposed project's impact on critical areas including stream corridors, etc. within 200 feet of the area of disturbance.

- 2. CharDham Hindu Temple/Readington
Use Variance & Preliminary Site Plan
25A Coddington Road**

Action date: September 11, 2005

Ms. Flynn stated that the TRC recommended to the board that the preliminary site plan and use variance application be deemed incomplete. Pursuant to Michael Sullivan's report dated August 15, 2005 the following waivers were recommended: beginning at page 7 of 13, #'s 24, 27 a and b.

Mrs. Goodwin made a motion to grant the above mentioned waivers. Mrs. Flynn seconded the motion. *Motion was carried with a vote of ayes, no nays recorded.*

E PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. Hunterdon Christian Church
Block 94, lot 1.203
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan
Action date: signed extension to August 18, 2005**

Anthony Koester, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for the applicant.

Chairman Fort stated that she had requested that the individual board members visit the site to inspect the hedgerow.

Ms. Flynn informed the board that the hedgerow appeared very sparse in some areas.

Ms. Goodwin recommended that the applicant should fortify the hedgerow with deciduous trees.

Ms. Hendry was not in favor of increasing the hedgerow. She stated that the board is burdening a church and helping a developer in the future by making the church add to the buffer.

Mr. Denning expressed to the board that he would not want to restrict the church from using the buffer area for recreational use. He indicated that he would agree to adding a few trees, but not planting lines of trees.

Madam Chair recommended that the applicant's landscaper work with the board's planner to come up with a careful placing of plantings to fill in the buffer.

Mr. Cannarella stated that in response to Princeton Hydro's letter dated May 27, 2005 the applicant has performed additional soil tests out at the site to address each comment in that letter. They performed additional trench tests out in the field right in line with where the proposed infiltration trench

would be located. They performed 5 trench tests. One of the tests proved a permeability result of 2 inches per hour which is above what is required by the Department of Environmental Protection regulations.

Attorney Moore swore in the witness, Geoffrey Goll of Princeton Hydro.

Mr. Goll testified that he witnessed the basin flood tests. The applicant has moved their trench so that it is located in an area where they will receive better infiltration. Mr. Goll stated that his office should review the revised plans.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mrs. Flynn certified for the record that she listened to the tapes from meeting that she missed on May 19, 2005.

Mr. Moore suggested that Mr. Koester's letter addressed to Mr. Moore dated June 2, 2005 should be reviewed by the board to make sure that the board did not have any outstanding issues.

Mr. Moore read the following into the record from that letter:

Variations as to buffer should be granted to the extent that it is necessary to (a) allow the detention basin and drainage easement to remain in a 50 foot buffer along the northwest boundary, (b) allow a septic system to remain in the 50 foot buffer along the southwest boundary to the rear, since the applicant has requested they would like to be able to mow the grass up to 25 feet from the rear southwest boundary. That may mean that the buffer is reduced to 25 feet along the southwest boundary. Alternatively, any 50 foot then buffer would contain an exception allowing the church to mow up to 25 feet from the rear of the boundary and to use it for outdoor recreation. The board determined that the applicant should work with the planner to fill in the spaces in the hedgerow. The road widening is not required. The northwest buffer area plantings are allowed to be tapered to a double row of evergreens beyond the detention basin as proposed. The trees currently planned to be planted within the embankment of the detention basin will be planted elsewhere. A shrub line will not be required and no plantings other than those currently planted will be required for the northwest 50 foot buffer. The church will provide a conservation easement for acceptance with respect to the area of the 50 foot buffer. The southwest boundary shall remain as an old farm hedgerow protected by a 25 foot conservation easement to allow mowing and outdoor use up to 25 feet from the boundary. The applicant's parking plan for 98 spaces shall be allowed based upon the

church's testimony of actual use, the church's traffic engineer's testimony, and that of the board's traffic engineer.

Mr. Koester stated that there are waivers with regard to sidewalks, light pole facing and curbing of parking areas. The existing sign will remain with the existing lighting.

Mr. Denning made a motion to approve the application with the above mentioned conditions. Mrs. Goodwin seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Mr. Denning	aye
Mrs. Flynn	aye
Mrs. Goodwin	aye
Ms. Hendry	aye
Mr. Staats	aye
Madam Chair	aye

- 2. Our Lady Of Lourdes Church
Block 28, lot 10
Preliminary Major Site Plan
Action date: October 14, 2005**

Michael Denning recused himself from this application.

Ms. Hendry stated that her children were baptized at the church, although she is not a member of the church. If no one had any objections, she would continue. Mr. Simms stated that he did not have an objection with having Ms. Hendry continuing to participate with this application.

Mr. Simms stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. He informed the board that the application is for an expansion of the present parking lot by adding 96 new spaces.

Attorney Moore swore in the witness James Mantz.

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

Mr. Mantz described sheet 2 of 6 of the site plan. It depicts the 2 entrances and exits to the parking lot.

Exhibit:

A-1 Parking lot expansion for Our Lady of Lourdes Church, prepared by James J. Mantz, P.E. dated 11/9/04, revised 5/4/05.

Mr. Mantz stated that the applicant is proposing to close the westerly most entrance/exit and maintaining the most easterly most entrance/exit. They also propose to move the second exit further to the east.

Mrs. Flynn wanted to know if cars would be stacking when they are trying to leave the parking lot.

Father Leonard Rusay stated that during the holidays they try to have the cars travel east out of the parking lot. The announcement is made every year and it is in the bulletin. During the regular traffic times, most people already have this pattern.

Mrs. Flynn wanted to know when the church had their religious education. Father Rusay answered Monday and Wednesday nights and afternoons.

Father Rusay stated that the families drive more than one car to the service.

Mr. Simms stated that currently the parking spaces are proposed to be 10 feet wide. The engineer suggested 9 feet. Father Rusay stated that they have looked at the type of cars that are being parked in the lot. He indicated that they are the larger vehicles.

Ms. Hendry asked if the parking spaces were 9 feet wide how many more parking spaces could be picked up. Mr. Mantz answered 6 additional spaces.

Mr. Hansen stated that he suggested that the applicant consider 9 foot stalls, that way they could expand their islands and decrease the impervious coverage. If the islands were pulled away from Pulaski Road, they would get more green space between the edges of the parking area. This could help their stormwater calculations.

Mr. Mantz stated that there is a concrete walkway, a striped out space and there is a pedestrian walkway. He stated that they are proposing landscaping in front of the parking areas and around the detention basin.

Ms. Goodwin informed the board that she did not have a problem with the number of parking spaces, however, the parking does have to be screened from Pulaski Road.

Father Rusay informed the board that they have a group of parishioners who are volunteers that are working to beautify this area with plantings.

Mrs. Flynn suggested that the planner should work with the applicant's engineer and the applicant should create a landscaping plan.

Mr. Staats wanted to know if the area marked garage was ever considered for parking. Father Rusay stated that this area floods and becomes muddy in the rainy season.

Father Rusay stated that the lights are only on when they turn them on. Mrs. Flynn stated that the board would prefer shorter light poles and lights more evenly spaced.

Mr. Mantz stated that he would be willing to go over the lighting plan with the engineer.

Madam Chair was concerned about the traffic. She recommended that Gary Dean provide a report by the next meeting. In turn, the plans will be forwarded to Scott Parker for his analysis too.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Richard Gardella stated that his mother-in-law, Marilyn Corcoran lives at 1 Pulaski Road. He wanted to know what the justification was for the additional parking.

Robert J. Cifelli parishioner and a member of the Knights of Columbus stated that during the holidays' he helps direct the traffic. They usually get 90 to 100 cars that park outside of the parking lot.

Ms. Hendry requested that prior to the next meeting, the overflow parking should be counted.

Mr. Gardella wanted to know how many parking spaces are utilized during the week. Father Rusay answered that it would depend on what is going on at the church.

Madam Chair recommended a site visit. She felt that trying to discuss this matter without viewing it is very difficult.

Ms. Hendry wanted to know who owns lot 7. Mr. Mantz answered that the church owns that lot.

Mr. Moore swore in the witness Richard Gardella.

Mr. Gardella wanted to know if a stormwater management report had been submitted. Mr. Hansen answered that they have submitted the document. His review letter has a number of issues that the applicant will need to revise.

Mr. Mantz stated that he will be taking into account the best management practices for the stormwater plan in order to satisfy Mr. Hansen's letter.

Mr. Gardella wanted to know if the applicant proposes a fence around the detention basin. Mr. Mantz stated that it would be more appropriate to plant trees around the basin. Mr. Hansen recommended that no fence be installed. He does not see it as a safety hazard. Mr. Mantz suggested Boxwood shrubbery, although Mr. Sullivan had disagreed with that variety. Mr. Mantz stated that he would make these changes and submit it on the next plan.

Mr. Gardella was concerned about the lighting. Mr. Mantz testified that this matter was going to be re-visited.

Joann Vinciguerra, the Committee Chairperson for the parking lot. She informed the board that the reason that they did not include Lot 7 is because it is not incorporated in the church property. They also wanted to preserve the mature trees.

Dawn Corcoran Gardella asked how they propose to remove the snow from the parking lot. Mr. Mantz answered that there will be a vegetative barrier between the parking lot and the residents so the snow removal will not be a problem for the neighboring property owners.

Ms. Gardella wanted to know how many mature trees were proposed to be removed. Mr. Mantz answered 6 trees.

Madam Chair stated that there is no question that the church needs more parking spaces. This is a difficult situation to resolve. You have to cut down trees so that the parking area can be increased due to people driving 3 cars to church. They have to come up with the best way of solving this problem that doesn't impact negatively on either the neighboring residents or the trees.

Mr. Staats suggested that the area near the garage should be looked at more closely.

Madam Chair suggested that the engineer review the area because neighbors are complaining about water in their basements.

Mr. Cifelli suggested that the board perform a site visit. He stated that he does the snow removal for the church and Ms. Corcoran's property is located at the highest elevation of the property, therefore, the runoff would not affect her property.

Marilyn Corcoran wanted to know why her basement filled up the same time the swale filled up.

Mr. Hansen stated that there is a water issue throughout the entire area. The basin is not a recharge basin. It is a detention basin. He did not feel that the basin is the cause of the water in her basement.

Marilyn Corcoran wanted to know who would maintain the improvements.

Mr. Mantz answered the church.

A report from Gary Dean will be forwarded to Scott Parker. The board decided to perform a site visit on Saturday, September 3, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. The board members will meet directly at the site.

Mr. Simms signed an extension to October 20, 2005 in case the applicant would not be prepared for the September meeting. However, the hearing is carried to September 15, 2005 without any further notice to the public.

F. 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