

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES  
April 11, 2011**

- A. Chairman Flynn called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and announced that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act had been met and that the meeting had been duly advertised.**

**B. Attendance:**

<b>Mrs. Allen</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mr. Cook</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mrs. Duffy</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mrs. Filler</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mrs. Flynn</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mayor Gatti</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mr. Klotz</b>	<b>absent</b>
<b>Mr. Monaco</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mr. Smith</b>	<b>absent</b>

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**March 28, 2011- Mr. Cook made a motion to approve the minutes. Mrs. Allen seconded the motion. *Motion* was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded.***

**D. CORRESPONDENCE:**

**No comments from the board.**

**E. RESOLUTIONS:**

**None**

**F. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

**None**

**G. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**1. Voucher Approval – Mrs. Allen made a motion to approve the vouchers as submitted. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. *Motion* was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded.***

**H. DISCUSSION:**

**1. Ordinance Review**

**Mrs. Allen stated that they had an ordinance subcommittee meeting. The issue was the inconsistencies regarding the checklist pages. It was discovered that there were contradictions. Based upon the new rule that is soon to be adopted, the definition in the ordinance for application must be updated. Cheryl Filler and Betty Ann Fort worked side by side on this review.**

**2. Ordinance Review (sample ordinance from Rocky Hill)**

**This was reviewed at a prior meeting. It was suggested that if an application remained dormant and is incomplete for at least 90 days, it would be dismissed without prejudice. The final form will be distributed for the next meeting. A notification will be placed in the application for development to let the applicant know that this ordinance exists.**

**3. By-Laws**

**The existing By-Laws at section 2:1-1 addresses completeness, so when the ordinance that was previously discussed, the By-Laws will have to be amended to reflect the change.**

**Effective May 5, 2011 is the date that the time of decision statutory law will be applicable. Section 2:4-9 of the By-Laws should be amended to reflect that change. By the next meeting, Attorney Kimson will provide the information to the board.**

**I. NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. Rocco Paternostra  
Block 36, L. 7  
Amendment to concept plan**

**For the record, Jerry Cook recused himself from participating in this application and left the dais.**

**Lawrence Fox, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for Mr. Paternostra. He informed the board that the applicant has been working on this application for approximately 17 years. A meeting took place with the board's professionals. A number of variances would be required. Sewer allocation has been granted. They are proposing 4 lots. A revised concept plan has been submitted to the board.**

**Robert Zederbaum testified that the plan before the board is a culmination of ideas that have been going back and forth for many years. The purpose of meeting with the board's professionals was to come up with an appropriate way to develop the property without going through all the design details. The intent was**

to meet as many of the zone perimeters as possible. In addition, they tried to protect the environmentally sensitive areas. They are proposing a 4 lot subdivision. They are slightly deficient in the contiguous usable area in two of the categories, thereby requiring variances. This has been accomplished by moving the entire subdivision closer to Railroad Lane and by keeping the rear of the property undisturbed. There is a proposed 50 foot access easement that was recommended by the professionals so that access could be obtained for passive recreation. A section in front of Lot 7.04 would also consist of additional open space area. This is an environmentally sensitive area. There is a short cul-de-sac road extended into the site. The stormwater management system has not been designed at this juncture.

Mr. Zederbaum indicated that the applicant has no objection to the contents or comments in Mr. Hansen's letter dated February 7, 2011. The purpose of this meeting was to get the comments from the board. There had been a suggestion by Mr. Sullivan that they reconfigure the lots and reduce the size since they will have public sewer.

Mrs. Allen stated that it is important to access the open space by retaining some road frontage in order to provide maintenance.

Mr. Hansen wanted the board to be aware that the road extending to the open space will either be by public or private road. Someone will have to maintain the road. The second item, is the board has to be aware that fire/rescue is critical. The radii might be the same as the edge of cul-de-sac, the width may need to be larger because the width of the fire truck and the radius of the fire truck to maneuver cannot take place on a 10 foot wide road. There may be more impervious coverage. When the applicant's engineer performed soil tests, he found no permeability on the property at all. This means, there is no way to reduce stormwater value. The applicant will require waivers for their stormwater management system, no matter how big they make the basin. The impervious coverage should be kept to a minimum, but safe enough that emergency vehicles can pass on the road. Lastly, the applicant and board are bound by the Residential Site Improvement Standards. This is what governs the design of the subdivision. Some diminimus exceptions or waivers may be possible, technically, the approval would have to go to the DCA for the submission of waivers.

Mrs. Filler wanted to know if there was another method they could use rather than construct a detention basin to help alleviate the runoff on the property. Mr. Hansen answered that unless you have some kind of permeability, they will always have an increase in volume.

Mr. Zederbaum suggested that the open space would be defined by a fence and bollards since it is located in between two lots.

**Mrs. Duffy stated that she is in favor of the lots facing the street as opposed to having the backyard back up to the open space. People do tend to use the property for their own use. It is important to have access to the open space.**

**Madam Flynn stated that she is in favor of having the stormwater basin located separate from someone's property. Mr. Hansen suggested that the board should be mindful that the township does not usually own nor maintain the basin. A homeowner association would have to be created to maintain the stormwater basin.**

**Mr. Hansen was concerned that the sketch that was prepared by Mr. Sullivan has to deal with the RSIS regulations and drainage. He would have to review it in more detail.**

**Mrs. Allen stated that since the applicant has been around for so long, the board would try to work with the applicant.**

**Attorney Kimson recapped the board's preferences. She stated that the board is inclined to approve the development layout sketch that Mr. Sullivan prepared, as long as it meets the fire official's approval for safety on the cul-de-sac radius. The board is inclined to have the homeowners association to own and maintain both stormwater basins and to have a clear open space connection between the open space and roadway.**

**Mrs. Filler recommended that the applicant be creative with the stormwater runoff. Perhaps they could capture the runoff and use it for lawn maintenance.**

**Mrs. Flynn reminded the applicant that the open space has to be delineated by a split rail fence and signs.**

**Mrs. Allen recommended that if there is a distance from the public road to the open space, that it be a fee dedication, not an easement dedication.**

**J. ADJOURNMENT:**

**Mr. Cook made a motion to adjourn at 8:37 p.m. Mrs. Allen seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Linda A. Jacukowicz**