READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
November 26, 2012

A. Chairman Flynn 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.

B. Attendance:

Mrs. Julia Allen	present
Mr. Jerry Cook	present
Mrs. Elizabeth Duffy	present
Mrs. Cheryl Filler	absent
Mrs. Marygrace Flynn	present
Mayor Thomas Auriemma	absent
Mr. John Klotz	present
Mr. Ronald Monaco	present
Mr. Benjamin Smith	present – arrived at 8:30 p.m.

Valerie Kimson, Esq., Mason, Griffin & Pierson
Michael Sullivan – Clark Caton & Hintz
Michael Hanrahan, Clark Caton & Hintz
John Hansen, Ferriero Engineering, Inc.
Stephen Souza, Princeton Hydro
Harold Maltz, Hamal Engineering Associates

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. November 13, 2012 – meeting cancelled – no minutes
2. October 22, 2012 Regular Meeting - Jerry Cook made a motion to approve the minutes. Ronald Monaco seconded the motion. All in Favor, no Nays recorded.
3. October 22, 2012 Executive Session Elizabeth Duffy made a motion to approve the minutes. Ronald Monaco seconded the motion. All in Favor, no Nays recorded.

D. CORRESPONDENCE:

1. The board had no comments regarding the correspondence.

E. RESOLUTIONS: -

None

F. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

None

G. OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Voucher Approval – John Klotz made a motion to approve the vouchers as submitted. Jerry Cook seconded the motion. All in Favor, no Nays recorded.

H. NEW BUSINESS: -

None

I. PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Rocco Paternostro
Block 36, L. 7
Preliminary Major Subdivision

Chairman Flynn announced that this matter is carried without further notice to the next Planning Board meeting scheduled for December 10, 2012.

2. Ryland Inn
Preliminary /Final Major Site Plan
111 Old Route 28 – Whitehouse
Action date: November 13, 2012

Jay Bohn, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. Mr. Bohn informed the board that the applicant is seeking approval for Phase I (a). He indicated that the applicant is requesting approval of all variances for the entire site, not just the Phase I (a) area. The testimony this evening will outline the details. The new Phase I (a) is not reflected on the plans that were previously submitted; however, the applicant will provide testimony and produce exhibits.

Mr. Monaco questioned how could the board grant variances for areas that are not part of the Phase I (a) presentation. Attorney Kimson answered that this is the applicant's burden to provide the proofs.

Chairman Flynn reminded the applicant that they must in advance of the meeting let the board's professionals know what the applicant is proposing.

David Maski, Professional Planner provided his credentials for the record and was sworn. The board accepted his qualifications.

Exhibit A-10 Overall Site Exhibit Plan dated November 21, 2012

William Tanner, Engineer described Exhibit A-10 to the board. The site currently has the existing Ryland Inn building. There is an existing court yard, a small veranda, a Porte cochere drop off and driveway in a one-way direction. There are two parking lots. The parking lot to the north is existing. The parking lot to the south is the proposed parking lot. There is an existing stone house to the east of the Ryland Inn which is to service the banquet hall number two. To the west is banquet hall number one. They are proposing a small terrace in an area around preserved trees. To the west they are creating the first new roadway that will allow for access behind the banquet hall in order to have a loading area. Mr. Tanner described the other phases of the project. The site has the existing driveways. On the site, about 18% of the site is composed of either porous walkways or porous pavements.

Exhibit A-11 Phasing plan November 19, 2012

The line for Phase I (a) will be located north and east of the hydroponic garden and continuing down to the driveway. This phase will consist of the existing inn and banquet hall number one; a terrace; and an area that consists of porous pavement that circulates behind the buildings to the north. Phase I (b) will consist of the second banquet facility, stone house, phase 1 (b) parking and the hydroponic garden. Phase 2 is the connecting road along the western property line and the hotel.

Exhibit A-12 Phasing exhibit plan November 21, 2012.

Mr. Tanner testified that this is another rendering with the existing parking lot, roadway, and the new driveway that goes behind banquet hall number one. This is exactly what was presented before, but they are trying not to move forward on Phase I (b). They are currently meeting with the Historic Preservation Commission. Overall phase one (a) requires no variances because the only variances they have are variances for other stages. They have no problem with the FAR coverage. This is the existing inn with the parking and driveways and an addition to the inn they propose a banquet hall with a driveway and parking.

Mr. Hansen wanted to know if the applicant met the parking requirement. Mr. Tanner explained that they have 125 chairs for the inn and that would require 32 parking spaces and the parking for the banquet hall would require 82 parking spaces. There are currently 89 spaces in the existing parking lot. There are 24 parking spaces in the proposed parking lot. Mrs. Flynn asked where would the employees park? Mr. Tanner stated in the rear parking lot.

Harold Maltz testified that the circulation plan is now changed back to the original plan, with a two way drive. The circulation is not changing. He is comfortable with the amount of parking for the phasing build-out. Mr. Maltz still needs to see the striping for the parking. Mr. Monaco requested that a new circulation plan be submitted, including the proposed signage.

Dr. Souza informed the board that he has questions about the layout. He felt that there were more disturbances other than what is shown on the plan.

Mr. Hansen stated that if this would be approved by the board, the applicant would have to submit revised plans that would mirror the conditions discussed at this meeting.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS:

There were no comments from the public.

Dr. Souza was concerned as to how they are going to connect the stormwater system during the phasing. In addition, he is apprehensive as to the tree removal. This would have to be more clearly defined.

Exhibit A-13 – Grading drainage soil erosion and sediment control November 19, 2012.

Dr. Souza commented that the existing parking lot and the catch basin are shown on the plan. He was concerned as to when they would be constructed. Mr. Tanner answered that for Phase I (a) the runoff would be sheet flow off of the property and will run off of the property as it does now. The sanitary sewer line will be installed in Phase 1 (a).

Mr. Maltz asked what type of vehicles deliver to the site. Mr. Tanner answered they will be box trucks and they will be able to perform a K-turn in order to navigate out of the parking lot.

Mr. Tanner stated that the required lighting will be installed for Phase I (a). All lighting fixtures will be consistent with what is currently on site. Regarding the design waivers listed in Mr. Hansen's report dated November 9, 2012, the applicant is requesting the following waivers: 148-70C(3) requires hairpin striped parking spaces. The striping proposed is conventional striping; and 148-70C (4) requires 10 ft. x 18 ft. parking stalls for high turnover uses such as retail. The applicant is proposing 9 ft. x 18 ft. parking stalls. As such, a design waiver for parking stall size will be required. 148-70C (3) requires hairpin striped parking spaces.

Dr. Souza was concerned that there is a connecting roadway that was originally listed in the original drainage stormwater calculations. Now in Phase I (a), it is not included. Mr. Tanner answered that this system was for roof run-off. Dr. Souza informed the board that the analysis must be re-calculated. Dr. Souza wanted to know if there was a change to the grading. If there is more site disturbance, how will this be mitigated? Mr. Hansen stated that they have submitted a drainage report. The phasing in the drainage report will have to be a condition of approval. It will have to be that Mr. Tanner submits an updated drainage report for Phase I (a). If the applicant cannot meet a favorable conclusion, they would have to come back to the board.

The board took a 5 minute break.

Mr. Tanner reviewed Mr. Hansen's report dated November 9, 2012. Regarding the conditions that pertain to Phase I (a), he will show the existing stormwater collections along Route 28 on the plan. The existing utilities will be on the plan. The tree removal will take place in phases. The traffic signs will be part of Phase I (a). There will be additional traffic signs that will be needed in the subsequent phases. The inverts for the proposed roof leader drain system would have to wait until they have architectural plans. The sanitary sewer must be installed in Phase I (a). The wells and water service connections would be clearly shown on the Phase I (a) plan. The lighting plan will be in this phase. Sheet 26 storm sewer profiles will be done in Phase I (a). The proposed entry gates will not be installed in the Phase I (a).

Regarding the November 9, 2012 report from Michael Sullivan, Clark Caton & Hintz, the following is a list of items that will be installed in Phase I (a). Floor Area Ratio calculations and charts must be supplied for the entire site; a detailed analysis of the impervious coverage proposed with the latest site plan revisions; all conditions set forth under 5.0 Site Plan will be provided; 5.1 Planting Plan and details will be provided in Phase I (a). Regarding the buffers, the hedgerow will provide a substantial buffer therefore; they will not be planting additional plantings. The buffer should be a recorded element on the plan and identified that it is a buffer and a conservation easement should be created to protect it. They will identify and label the evergreen species on the plan. The mechanical equipment will be buffered from view. There are already sufficient trees on the site. The height of all shade trees will be identified on the plan. The trees that will be protected and will be shown on the plan. The white oak location has been corrected on the plan. Parking and circulation and cross walks will be shown on the plan. The cross walks into the Phase I (a) parking lot will be placed on this plan. The traffic flow arrows will be satisfied partially in Phase I (a). The loading zone will be on the plan. The solid waste compliance; the site triangle will be shown; the accessibility will show on the plan; cobblestone detail will be on the plan; the pea gravel detail will be used which is a way of installing gravel so it is contained in cells. This will sit on the ground so they are stable and an inch of gravel will be placed on top. If the gravel were just placed on the ground, it would be difficult for women to walk on it in high heel shoes. This method is packed and the gravel does not move. The applicant is proposing the gravel paths so that it has more of a rural –

European theme. This is also porous rather than a solid surface walkway. Mr. Tanner agreed to provide all of the details for the proposed structures including the crosswalk, all paving surfaces, walls and fences.

Exhibit A-14 Permeable Paver information

Exhibit A-15 – Colored photographs of the Ryland Inn

Mr. Tanner testified that there will be a need for some landform protection in Phase I (a). He informed the board that the applicant will require a variance for the grade change in connection to the terrace. They will not need a variance in Phase I (a) for the change in topography. They are proposing grading so the applicant will require a variance. The directional signs and gates will not be constructed in Phase I (a). The lighting detail will be provided. The mounting height will be shown on the plan.

Exhibit: A-16 Traffic site plan revised November19, 2012

Mr. Tanner testified that it is a one way traffic circulation up to the inn. After that it becomes at two way circulation. The sheet is in the board's plan set identified as Sheet 18.

Mr. Maltz stated that since this is a new plan for Phase I (a), he would need to review the revised traffic circulation. The applicant agreed to submit an updated circulation plan.

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC OR BOARD MEMBERS:

There were no comments from the public or board members regarding the engineer's testimony.

Jose I. Carballo, of JCA Group, P.C. was previously sworn. Mr. Carballo stated that he is the architect for the applicant. He testified that he attended a meeting with the Historic Preservation Commission. They presented a revised plan at that time and the Historic Preservation Commission preferred and supported the newly revised architectural plan. The south elevation was a concern for them and they asked the applicant to make it a little less intense. They felt that it competed with the existing building.

A-17 Architectural plan dated July 5, 2012.

A-18 Architectural plan draft progress sheet

Based upon Historic Preservation Commission's comments, they are working with them and will meet again on site to go over each and every one of the existing buildings.

Michael Hanrahan, of Clark Caton and Hintz was sworn. He stated that Mr. Carballo's testimony is accurate. He attended the meeting with the Historic Preservation Commission and applicant. As it relates to Phase I (a) the arched gothic window was the source of concern for the Historic Preservation Commission. Exhibit A-18 has not been reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission. Any outdoor features were not presented at that meeting. Mr. Carballo stated that regarding the terrace wall, it is 5 foot high wall on the outside wall, but the inside wall of the terrace measures 3 feet from ground level. Mr. Hanrahan stated that specific materials were not shown; however, the recommendation from the Historic Preservation was to use simple, appropriate material.

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC OR BOARD MEMBERS:

There were no comments from the public or board members regarding the architect's testimony.

Kevin Kester, Landscape Architect with Van Cleef Engineering was sworn. Mr. Kester placed his credentials on the record. The board accepted his qualifications.

Mr. Kester testified that most of the landscape questions have been answered by the engineer. However, there is a tree protection plan around the trees that are going to be preserved. This information will be on the revised plans. He stated that he paced off the drip line for the trees to verify that they can provide the correct protection. Mr. Kester referred to Exhibit A-10. He stated that they are specifically dealing with a 24 inch oak and 45 inch oak. The underground retention area is in close proximity to the trees. The 45 inch oak is proposed to be near the terrace and will encroach slightly into the tree's drip line. The terrace will be built approximately 5 feet over the root system. The terrace will be 15 to 20 feet from the trunk of the 45 inch oak tree. Mr. Kester testified that they will consult with an arborist for techniques to help insure a better survival rate of the trees.

Dr. Souza requested that a table be submitted of the tree removal for Phase I (a) on the revised landscape plan. In his calculations, Dr. Souza estimates that there are approximately 26 trees greater than 8 inches in diameter. The Environmental Commission is concerned about the tree removal. This information will be helpful to ease their concerns.

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC OR BOARD MEMBERS:

There were no comments from the public or board members regarding the landscape architect's testimony.

Mr. Carballo was recalled. In Mr. Sullivan's report dated November 9, 2012, specifically at Section 5.3 he writes that pursuant to §148-60.I A there should not be a change in grade at any point on the site that exceeds two vertical feet. In addition a variance is needed regarding the topography changes in accordance with §148-60.IB. The applicant will need a variance from this requirement.

David Maski, Professional Planner, with Van Cleef Engineering stated his credentials for the record. The board accepted his qualifications. The variances are limited to two landform variances. One variance has to do with the wall and terrace and the other variance is part of the drainage swale system. The need for that variance is to accommodate the appropriate drainage of the site. There are no other variances associated with Phase I (a). Mr. Maski acknowledged the proposal as a whole in Phase I (a) meets certain purposes of the MLUL and placed the positive criteria on the record. This will allow the preservation of the site. The proposal meets the intent of the zone purpose and the variances will help to support the historic complex.

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Monaco stated that he is favor of approving the Phase I (a) application. However, the applicant could have amended their application and just presented Phase I (a) and not involved the remainder of the site. It would have made it easier to follow.

Mrs. Duffy agreed and stated that the Phase I (a) has complete testimony regarding that portion of the application.

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to approve Phase I (a) subject to the design waivers 2 and 3 from page 4 of John Hansen's report dated November 9, 2012,; more specifically identified as: Design Waivers: 148-70C (3) requires hairpin striped parking spaces. The striping proposed is conventional striping.148-70C (4) requires 10 ft. x 18 ft. parking stalls for high turnover uses such as retail. The applicant is proposing 9 ft. x 18 ft. parking stalls. As such, a design waiver for parking stall size will be required. Conditions: The existing stormwater collection system along Route 28 must be depicted on the plan. Pipe inverts and inlet elevations must be provided. All existing utilities shall be shown on this existing conditions plan. The plans shall clarify whether the existing improvements and trees depicted for demolition/removal will all be removed during Phase I or if they are to be removed in conjunction with the other phases.Traffic signs and pavement markings shall be provided on the plans. Any construction details for the proposed helicopter pad shall be provided on the plans. This shall include any ground mounted lighting or markers. All phase IA improvements and limit of disturbance shall be clearly shown on the plans. Proposed spot elevations shall be provided for all pavement corners and points of curvature along the edge of pavement. All inconsistencies between plan view and profile drawings shall be corrected. Inverts for the proposed roof leader drain system shall be detailed on the plans. The proposed sanitary sewer lines shall be revised to provide angle points of 90 degrees or greater in order to facilitate flow and maintenance. The location of the existing and proposed sanitary sewer conveyances for the existing 1 story block bakery and existing 1-1/2 story stone dwelling shall be shown on the plan. Pipe inverts and inlet elevations shall be provided for the existing storm sewer along Old Route 28.A sawcut line shall be shown where utility connections will be constructed within the cartway of Old Route 28. A trench detail for the work in Old Route 28 should be provided. The wells and water service connections shall be clearly shown on the plans. A detail for the concrete base and footing for the proposed area lighting shall be added to the plans. Hunterdon County Soil Conservation District approval is required. Hunterdon County Planning Board approval is required. The sanitary sewer crossings shall be depicted on the profiles. The stormwater management system design shall utilize a proposed curve number of 98 for the porous pavement unless additional soil logs and physical permeability tests are performed in accordance with the BMP manual, and it is confirmed by the Board Engineer and Board Environmental Consultant (upon review of the test results) that a lower curve number is acceptable for design. The stormwater management report shall be revised to show that the Phase IA portion of the project will meet the technical standards of the ordinance on its own. The stormwater management report shall be revised to include runoff coefficient, inlet drainage areas, and rainfall intensity data in the combined Pipe/Node Report. The conduit capacity calculations in the stormwater management report shall be revised to include the applicable inlet drainage parameters to demonstrate conduit capacity between each inlet and structure. Offsite stability calculations for the proposed outfalls shall be provided in accordance with the Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control in New Jersey, Chapter 21.The sewer design flow for Phase IA shall be provided on the plans in accordance with NJDEP standards. If the total design flow (post development) for the site will be greater than 8,000 gallons per day, then a Treatment Works Approval is required from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. All construction and site improvements shall comply with the applicable Township ordinances and standards, except for those items for which waivers are specifically provided in any approving resolution. A landscape maintenance guarantee shall be posted in accordance with the requirements of 148-105. Prior to commencing construction, the applicant shall deposit inspection fees and establish an escrow account with the Township Administrator in accordance with the requirements of the Land Development Ordinance. Prior to commencing construction on the site, the applicant shall schedule and participate in a pre-construction meeting with the municipal engineer. The meeting shall be attended by the applicant, his contractor, and the municipal engineer. The sanitary sewer flows shall be metered and reported at sufficient frequency at the owner's expense. If it is determined that

the sanitary sewer flows are higher than expected or the uneven flow becomes problematic for the sewer plant, then it shall be remediated at the owner's expense with a tank which will release the sewerage during the slower periods. In addition approving the two variance from section 5.3 1 and 3 of Michael Sullivan's report dated November 9, 2012, specifically a variance from §148-60.1 for a change in grade exceeding 2 vertical feet and including all of the conditions that have been discussed tonight in terms of additional submissions and all of the comments that have been made will be incorporated into a resolution that will be drafted by the attorney; the stormwater requirements and the stormwater discussion with Dr. Souza be worked out satisfactorily to Dr. Souza's specifications. Approving the two design waivers and two variances are the only variances specifically related to Phase I (a). The traffic circulation plan and signs must be to the satisfaction of the traffic engineer. Mr. Klotz seconded the motion.

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	abstain
Madam Chair	aye

J. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cook made a motion to adjourn at 11:10 p.m. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz