

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**March 23, 2015**

The Meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Filler at 7:36 p.m. stating that the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Law have been met and that this meeting has been duly advertised.

**Members present:** Julia Allen, Jerry Cook, Elizabeth Duffy, Cheryl Filler, Betty Ann Fort, Ben Smith

**Also present:** Attorney, Victoria Britton  
Engineer, John Hansen  
Planner, Michael Sullivan  
Environmental, Dr. Stephen Souza

**Members absent:** Christopher John, Ronald Monaco, Marygrace Flynn

**MINUTES:**

A Motion was made by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Cook, that the Minutes of March 9, 2015 be approved as circulated. Motion was carried with a vote of ayes all, nays none recorded.

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

Letter from Maser Consulting P.A., dated March 5, 2015, noticing a Freshwater Wetlands and Flood Hazard area application. No action to be taken on this matter.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**Ryland Inn Property, LLC**  
**Block 14, Lot 29**  
**Site Plans**

**Present for Applicant:** Jay Bohn, Attorney  
William Tanner, Engineer  
Gabe Bailer, Planner and Project Manager  
Jose Carballo, Architect  
Frank Cretella, Owner/Applicant

Mr. Carballo produced the revised architectural plans for the proposed hotel. He advised that the building remained at three (3) stories, with the same footprint on the first floor, but the second and third floors had been cutback reducing the overall mass of the hotel.

**Exhibit A-21** was introduced: Ryland Hotel, revision date March 23, 2015 prepared by Jose Carballo Architectural Group P.C.

Mr. Smith inquired about the railings around the flat roof.

Mr. Carballo advised that the flat roofs are not accessible, the feature mimicks the look of the Ryland Inn.

Ms. Duffy confirmed that Applicant will meet with the Readington Township Historical Preservation Committee (the "HPC") to discuss materials and colors, and requested the action be added to the list of potential provisions for approval.

Mr. Sullivan requested that the final material, colors and finishes be memorialized on a board for permanent record keeping.

Mr. Bailer testified as to the positive and negative criteria of each of the variances the Applicant is requesting:

site grading to exceed two (2) feet: The request is necessary due to the natural topography of the land. Fill is required in three (3) locations, the proposed hotel, new parking lot and the stone cottage.

minimum front yard setback: Each of the existing dwellings require a setback, they are all pre-existing non-conforming to the minimum requirement of three hundred (300) feet. As the ideal location for the proposed hotel, so as not to block the view of the Ryland Inn, is on the westerly side of the property; the location requires a minimum front yard setback of 37.65 feet.

minimum side yard setback: The bakery building is an existing building with a side yard setback of 12.4 feet; this is a pre-existing non-conforming use. The proposed catering hall will have a side yard setback of 39.53 feet, a slight deviation from the required minimum of forty (40) feet.

impervious coverage: The total build out of the three (3) phases will require 44.38% of impervious coverage, a deviation of 8.38%. The Applicant is requesting this variance to build out the property to its fullest intentions while providing an adequate number of parking stalls and pathways for pedestrians to walk. Pervious asphalt used by the Applicant on-site will mitigate stormwater runoff and environmental concerns for the property.

parking between building line and street right-of-way: This variance is required for the existing and new parking lots. Applicant is building the new lot in such a way as to not block the view of the Ryland Inn from the street.

wall height: The maximum height permitted is four (4) feet. Applicant proposes a five and one half (5 ½) foot high wall in front of the parking lot to reduce the sight of vehicles parked in the lot from the road, allowing for a better view of the Ryland Inn. The wall will also reduce illumination from headlights of vehicles on-site from the road.

**Exhibit A-22** was introduced: Overall Site Plan, revision date March 23, 2015, prepared by Van Cleef Engineering Associates

Mr. Tanner indicated the two (2) areas on the property that will have more than two (2) feet of cut and/or fill: (i) the eastern side of the new parking lot and; (ii) the area in front of the hotel and moving back towards the hydroponic garden. In total there will be 30.2% of topographic changes to the property; within the 35% allowed by ordinance.

Mr. Bailer testified that Applicant did not require a variance for the topographic changes, but did require one for the topographic change setback as the hotel will have one at four (4) feet.

directional sign area and height: Applicant proposes a sign that is seven and one half (7 ½) feet in height and fourteen (14) square feet in area as it is better for mobility and pedestrians.

identification sign: The ordinance allows for a maximum of one (1) sign, Applicant is proposing two (2) signs as the entrance has two (2) pillars, each one with a sign.

Break at 8:05 P.M.

Reconvened at 8:11 P.M.

street tree quantity and parking area tree quantity: **Exhibit A-15** shows the build-out of the property with landscaping. Applicant is providing seventeen (17) trees along the street and sixty three (63) in the second parking area.

Mr. Bohn testified that the ordinance requires nineteen (19) trees along the street and sixty three (63) in the parking area. Applicant is happy to remove some or all of the parking lot trees, as some can be planted elsewhere on the property. This will allow for a clean view of the Ryland Inn; otherwise the trees block the view.

Ms. Fort inquired about the approximate number of trees that could be planted elsewhere.

Mr. Bohn advised that Applicant could plant some along the back as a buffer and along the eastern side of the property. Mr. Cretella advised that fifteen (15) trees can be planted elsewhere on the property, and will work with Mr. Sullivan on this issue.

hairpin striped parking spaces: This was a previous request granted during Phase IA, Applicant is again requesting it to conform the two parking areas.

traffic flow arrow: As the new parking area pavement will be porous, it is not recommended to paint arrows as the paint will disintegrate over time.

parking stall: The ordinance requires parking stalls ten (10) feet by eighteen (18) feet, Applicant is requesting nine (9) feet by ten (10) feet. This was previously requested and granted during Phase IA, Applicant wishes to conform the two (2) parking areas.

Mr. Bailer concluded by saying that the requested variances allow Applicant to promote the preservation of the historic site and district. The application blends new and old to complement each other, as the Ryland Inn is the anchor of this historic district.

Open to Public

Todd Terricone – 6 Lamington Road – inquired about any plans to address the sound quality.

Mr. Bailer advised that it is the Ryland Inn's policy to not permit any outdoor activity after a certain time of night.

Mr. Cretella testified that the outside patio is for the ceremony and cocktail hour for one (1) to one and one half (1 ½) hours beginning sometime around 6 – 7 P.M., with the reception held indoors.

Ms. Fort inquired about the use of live music in the hotel.

Mr. Cretella testified that the hotel is designed for rooms only, there is no event space within the hotel.

Mr. Tanner addressed the most current traffic report submitted by Mr. Harold Maltz, Readington Township's traffic expert. Applicant has agreed to all of the work indicated in the report; except for the following: (i) the requirement of a 'no left hand turn sign' as guests needing to proceed onto Route 22 East are required to turn left as the ramp to Route 22 East is to the left; and (ii) the site is over-signed with yellow crosswalk signs, stop signs, etc. Mr. Tanner indicated that putting in the number of signs proposed by Mr. Maltz would take away from the overall look and feel of the historic property.

Ms. Filler inquired about the markings for the crosswalks.

Mr. Tanner indicated that the crosswalks, although not marked, would be made from a different material, color and texture than the driveway. The crosswalks are on the property to take the guests to their destinations.

**Exhibit A-23** was introduced: Topographic Analysis for Ryland Inn, dated March 23, 2015, prepared by Van Cleef Engineering Associates

Mr. Cretella pointed out the two (2) patios by the side of the catering hall and the one (1) behind the barn.

Mr. Tanner testified that the topographical changes to the property will be 30.2%, under the 35% allowable by ordinance. Mr. Sullivan inquired whether this calculation included the patios, specifically the terrace located near Banquet Hall 2. Mr. Tanner stated that his calculations for topographical changes did not include the patios and terrace, and that he believed the patios and terrace would come out 'more or less' to the existing grade. However, if the patios and terrace were included in the calculations, Mr. Tanner believed that the new calculations would still be less than 35%, although he had not undertaken that specific calculation. Applicant agreed to submit a revised topographical analysis including the patios and terraces as a condition of approval.

Mr. Hansen indicated that Applicant should incorporate all of the changes suggested in his report and outline those conditions before plans are signed and construction begins.

Dr. Souza testified that he and Mr. Tanner discussed the gs32 analysis. Test pits will be required to determine accurate infiltrated information.

Ms. Filler inquired if the signs had been approved by the HPC.

Ms. Fisher-Olsen advised that approximately two (2) years ago, the HPC reviewed small directional signs, but if any changes had been made since, Applicant would have to meet with the HPC again for review and approval.

Ms. Filler asked that a condition be added for the approval of signs by the HPC.

Attorney Britton asked Applicant to address the October 2014 correspondence from John Barczyk, Township Fire Official, as to water supply and adequacy.

Mr. Tanner testified that Applicant is working with New Jersey American Water to bring water on-site. Mr. Cretella testified that there would be adequate water supply and volume to address the development's fire suppression needs.

Mr. Bohn addressed the proposed condition #32 as it pertains to obtaining approvals from the water company and the NJDEP – TWA prior to signature of the plans. He asked that obtaining approvals from these agencies not be a precondition for signing the plans.

With regard to the public water connection, Mr. Hansen advised the Board that the most recent Phase IA approval for the site is operating on a temporary Certificate of Occupancy (“CO”) with a stand-by fire suppression system as opposed to the conventional sprinkler system required by code since public water has not been extended to the site. He recommended to the Board that the condition should remain as it stands since the public water connection is critical to the safe operation of the site.

Mr. Cretella testified that it’s just a matter of time until New Jersey American Water can supply water to the subject site. Mr. Cretella said that his team has been working diligently on obtaining the required easement through the TD Bank site which is necessary for the project.

Mr. Hansen indicated that if Applicant builds the site, he must understand that without water on-site he will not be approved for a CO. Mr. Hansen did not agree with it, but if Mr. Cretella was willing to acknowledge the risk, Mr. Hansen said the Board could consider the request.

With regard to the sanitary sewer approval from NJDEP, Mr. Hansen said he could accept a condition that requires either the applicant to obtain the required permit or produce a letter of non-jurisdiction from the NJDEP prior to plan signature.

Mr. Carballo indicated that the guest houses, barns, hotel and banquet hall all need fire suppression.

Ms. Duffy advised that it was a risk for Applicant to have the site functioning with no public water.

Mr. Hansen advised the Board that they should make the construction and operation of the public water connection a condition of a temporary or final CO for Phase IB, II and III and a final CO for Phase IA.

Dr. Souza indicated that there is nothing within the plans or stormwater maintenance plans on sealcoating, paving over or maintenance of the porous pavement. Dr. Souza suggested that it be noted somewhere that the porous pavement not be changed in any capacity at any time.

Mr. Sullivan advised the Board that this is something you want to track over time, as once you stop performing, there is a potential for stormwater runoff and flooding.

Dr. Souza suggested creating a deed restriction that specifically identifies the porous pavement. He also advised that a note be added to the plans that clearly indicate the porous pavement as a stormwater system that cannot be altered.

The use of signs was addressed by the Board and agreed that no crosswalk signs were required on-site, but stop signs would be placed at major intersections and the end of the driveways.

A Motion was made by Ms. Fort, seconded by Mr. Smith, to approve Phase IB, II and III for preliminary site plan with the conditions as listed on the Potential Conditions list dated March 23, 2015 with the addition of the following:

1. Engineering language to require porous pavement remains porous, with the addition of a deed restriction and a notation on the plans;
2. The public water connection be constructed and operational before a temporary or final CO for Phase IB, II and III or a final CO for IA is approved;
3. Applicant must either receive approval from the NJDEP or a letter of non-jurisdiction demonstrating that the NJDEP does not need TWA for a particular phase of construction;
4. Applicant must have materials, colors and finishes approved by the HPC and provided on a materials board for permanent record keeping;
5. Applicant must have signs approved by the HPC; and
6. Applicant must submit a revised plan demonstrating topographic analysis is under thirty five percent (35%) including patios and terraces.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

A Motion was made by Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Duffy, to adjourn the meeting at 9:28 P.M. The motion was carried with a vote of ayes all, nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted,



Rebekah Harms  
Planning Board Secretary