

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
January 14, 2008**

- A. **Valerie Kimson, Esq. 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.**

Present:

**Julia Allen
Jerry Cook
Elizabeth Duffy
Cheryl Filler
Dan Getz
John Klotz
Ronald Monaco
Ben Smith
Marygrace Flynn**

**Michael Sullivan, Clarke – Caton & Hintz
Valerie Kimson, Esq. Purcell, Ries, Shannon, Mulcahy & O’Neill
H. Clay McEldowney – Hatch, Mott & McDonald
Dr. Steven Souza, Princeton Hydro**

- B. **Reorganization:**

Valerie Kimson, Esq., swore in the following Planning Board members:

**Julie Allen-Class III for a term of one year.
Ronald Monaco-Class II for a term of one year
Dan Getz - Class I for a term of one year
Marygrace Flynn – Class IV for a term of four years
Cheryl Filler – Class IV for a term of four years**

Nominations for Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Secretary and Professionals

Mrs. Filler nominated Marygrace Flynn for Chairperson. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion.

Attorney Kimson asked if there were any more nominations for Chairman. None were indicated. A vote was taken on the Chairperson position. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

The meeting was turned over to Chairman Flynn.

Mrs. Filler made a motion to nominate Elizabeth Duffy Vice Chairman. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Chairman Flynn retained the nomination of Secretary. Mrs. Duffy made the motion to nominate Linda Jacukowicz. Mr. Klotz seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Chairman Flynn entertained the nomination for Engineer. Mrs. Filler nominated Hatch, Mott & McDonald as Engineer. Mr. Klotz seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Chairman Flynn entertained the nomination for Professional Service Contracts. The first nomination is for the solicitor. Mrs. Filler nominated Valerie Kimson from the law firm of Purcell, Ries, Shannon, Mulcahy & O'Neill. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to nominate Scott Parker of Jacobs, Edwards & Kelcey as Traffic Engineer. Mr. Klotz seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Mrs. Filler made a motion to nominate Clarke, Caton & Hintz as Professional Planner. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Mrs. Filler made a motion to nominate Hatch Mott & McDonald as land surveyor. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Mrs. Allen made the motion to nominate Key-Tech Inspection and Testing Services. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Mrs. Filler nominated Princeton Hydro as Environmental Consultants. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Mrs. Allen made a motion to nominate Ostegaard Acoustical Associates as Acoustical Consultants. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Chairman Flynn set the schedule for the Planning Board Meetings for the year 2008. The meetings will take place on the second and fourth Monday of each month. The second Monday will be for development applications. The fourth Monday will be set aside for planning work and administration. If the meeting falls on a holiday, the meeting will take place on the succeeding day. There will be no meeting the fourth

Monday in December. Chairman Flynn asked for a motion to accept these dates. Mr. Smith made the motion. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

C. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Mrs. Filler and Mrs. Allen volunteered to work on the Technical Review Committee for 2008. The meetings will take place prior to the Planning Board meetings, unless noticed. Mrs. Allen made a motion to approve the dates. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

D. MINUTES

1. December 10, 2007 – Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the minutes. Mrs. Allen seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

2. Executive Session December 10, 2007 - Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

E. CORRESPONDENCE:

Mrs. Filler wanted to know if there were any details regarding the LOI application submitted by Merck and Company. Mr. McEldowney informed the board that he did not know if any immediate plans, however, would look into it and report his findings at the next meeting.

F. PUBLICATIONS:

**Hunterdon Democrat
Hunterdon Review
Courier News
Star Ledger
Express Times**

Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the publications. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

G. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

None

H. OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Voucher approval

Mr. Cook made a motion to approve the payment of vouchers. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

I. RESOLUTIONS:

- 1. Michael Eng
Minor Subdivision
Block 97, lot 2**

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to approve the resolution. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

- 2. Adner Ebeb Realty Corp.
Block 39, Lot 8.01
Request an extension of time to approval**

Mr. Cook made a motion to approve the resolution. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

- 3. 2007 Reexamination of the Master Plan**

Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the resolution. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

- 4. Mountain Woods
Preliminary Major Subdivision
Block 4, lot 57**

This matter will be carried to the next meeting.

J. OTHER BUSINESS:

- 1. An ordinance amended §148-50
Mandatory language to be included in conservation easement**

Attorney Kimson stated that the latest version includes the revisions that were discussed at the last meeting which was to eliminate the ability to remove non-invasive species. Therefore, there shall be nothing removed from the conservation easement. It also includes a section that the applicant would have to pay to the township an inspection fee for the purposes of the township inspection of the conservation easement subsequent to construction. Also a section is included that persons violating the terms of the conservation easement would be subject to penalties as provided for in the township ordinances.

Dr. Souza wanted to remind the board that ANJEC has grants available. It would provide money to the township in order to develop an actual procedure and mapping to allow everyone to know where the easements are located. Additionally a recognizable invasive species could be targeted. This could be in a digital format so that it could be accessed online or hard copies. Mrs. Allen suggested that when the invasive vegetation is removed, it must be replaced by native vegetation.

Mr. Klotz stated that he made a motion to approve the ordinance as amended and to recommend it be forwarded to the Township Committee for their review. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion.

Roll call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye

Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Getz	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to direct Dr. Souza to assist the Environmental Commission prepare an ANJEC grant.

K. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. Serra, Anthony & Judith
Preliminary Major Site Plan
Block 36, Lot 96
587 Route 22 East
Action date: January 24, 2008**

Madam Chair addressed the public and reviewed the procedure that will be followed during the hearing.

Cheryl Filler left the meeting @8:05 p.m.

Anthony Serra, Esq., stated that he is the co-applicant with his wife and is also acting as his own attorney.

Attorney Kimson swore in the following witnesses:

**Robert Clerico Van Cleef Engineering
Ian Hill Van Cleef Engineering
Eric Trepkau Architect
Gary Dean – Traffic Engineer
H. Clay McEldowney
Michael Sullivan
Steven Souza**

Mr. Serra stated that they are proposing a 4 room kindergarten school that will accommodate children ages 4 through 6. It will consist of 5,995 square feet and will be one story. It will be handicapped accessible. They are proposing an enrichment intergenerational program. One of the conditional use requirements is to have 50 foot setbacks.

Exhibit A-1 Colorized picture with proposed building and partial site plan

Mr. Serra addressed all of the criteria for a conditional use in the Village Residential zone.

Ian Hill stated that he has a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering from the New Jersey Institute of Technology and graduated in 2001 and licensed in the State of New Jersey in 2007. He is employed with Van Cleef Engineering Associates in Lebanon, New Jersey.

Mr. Hill referred to Exhibit A2.

Exhibit A-2 – Colored rendering of site plan.

Regarding the report from Michael Sullivan dated January 9, 2008, Mr. Serra stated that on page 4, item number 5.2, identifying steep slopes to the east that are beyond the 100 foot conservation easement has to be also included into the conservation easement. On page 5, there are 7 conditions of the conditional use which have been addressed. On page 6, item 7.2 they applied to the Historic Preservation Commission approximately one year ago and never received a response. Mr. Smith stated that he is a member of the Historic Preservation Commission and that they are very responsive. It was agreed that the applicant would re-apply to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Additionally regarding section 7.3.1 of Mr. Sullivan's report, Mr. Serra indicated that there is a general comment about the layout of the building, parking, stormwater and the playground being undesirable and that the applicant should place the building closer to the highway and place the parking and stormwater features behind the building. Mr. Hill stated that the layout of the property in the front makes the building envelope restrictive. The building could not be shifted up towards the front any further. There would not be sufficient area in the back of the building to construct a detention basin and the playground area. The current layout in Mr. Hill's opinion is optimizing the space available for parking and circulation.

Mr. Sullivan stated that visually the site would be offensive with the basin and parking proposed to be located in the front. These are items that are required to be screened. Mr. Sullivan's recommendation was to densely screen the basin and parking area. The location of the basin and parking were discussed with the applicant's engineer during the completeness phase of the application. Mr. Serra testified that they spent many hours working on Mr. Sullivan's suggestions, but there was no way to place the parking and the basin at the rear of the property.

Mr. Hill addressed section 7.2 of Mr. Sullivan's report. He stated that the parking along the westerly side is set perpendicular to the rear property line, rather than parallel to this property line that results with minor encroachments into the buffer. They would need a waiver for this item.

Mrs. Duffy indicated that the detention basin also encroaches into the buffer area. Mr. Hill confirmed that was correct and it would be eliminated.

Mr. Monaco wanted clarification about the setback area. Mr. Sullivan answered that there is a 50 foot front yard setback, 30 foot side and rear yard set back. The drawings show 50 for front, side and rear. Mr. Serra stated that the school requirement supersedes the conditional use requirement. The buffer is 50 feet to the adjacent residential property lines. Mr. Monaco stated that this is important because it relates to the intensity of the development on the lot and the use that is proposed in the buffer. He did not feel that it should be used for the playground area. Mr. Sullivan read the buffer definition to the board. Mr. Serra testified that the applicant is proposing a 20 foot buffer. There is a fence along the property line and they will agree to plant vegetation in that buffer. They have no intention of having the children play in the 20 foot buffer area. They are requesting a waiver of the 50 foot buffer requirement. Mrs. Duffy was concerned about the placement of playground equipment in the 50 foot buffer. Mr. Serra stated that they will address that issue later.

Madam Chair was still assessing Mr. Sullivan's suggestion to place the parking and detention basin at the rear of the property. She indicated that often the applicant's professional's work with the board's professionals to bring about solutions.

Exhibit A-3 Sheet 5 of the site plan "drainage grading and Utility plan"

Mr. Clerico addressed Exhibit A-3 wherein he pointed out that this suggestion was looked at extensively. In order to have the basin fit to meet the volume requirements, it was designed with an interior retaining wall. The setback issue is critical for the building because it is a conditional use standard. If they violated the setback, this board would no longer have jurisdiction over the application. The board's professionals recommended that the applicant enhance the buffer and they would be willing to do that. As far as the basin in the front, it is an interior lined basin. It has a clean distinct line around the edge. They would buffer the basin with plantings.

Mr. Monaco indicated that what is driving the size of the basin is the size of the building. If the building was decreased, the detention basin would reduce and the number of parking spaces would be reduced. This board cannot take into account financial considerations in any application. He wanted to know if there was something that drives the applicant to have that number of students. Mr. Serra answered that the building can hold 80 students because of the size of the classrooms.

Michael Sullivan and Dr. Souza both agreed that an underground detention system is a viable alternative for this site. Dr. Souza stated that the detention basin itself is not being factored into the overall pollutant removal efficiency. It is being accomplished by a manufactured treatment device and cleaning up by the buffer that extends into the woods. The basin is there only for peak flow management.

The board took a 5 minutes break and returned at 9:05 p.m.

Mr. Serra stated for the record that they will give the underground detention basin some more consideration.

Judith Serra testified that she has taught kindergarten for years. She is proposing a 2 year private school program. The children would start at 4 years of age and stay until they are 6 years old and then go on to first grade. She is proposing an intergenerational program where seniors will come and work with the children. The program for the K-1 will run from 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The K-2 program will run 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. There will be a half hour drop off time. Teachers will take the children from the cars to the classroom. They are proposing a half hour for arrival and dismissal.

Mrs. Duffy wanted to know how many employees are proposed. Mrs. Serra answered 4 teachers and support staff, for a total of 9 people. Mrs. Duffy was concerned because 9 of the 20 parking spaces will be used for the staff.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS:

There were no questions from the public for this witness.

Gary Dean traffic engineer stated that many of his findings are predicated on 80 students, but the reality is that they will be operating with fewer students. Reviewing the site plan, there is a proposed cross walk and entrance on the westerly façade of the building and this would be the first space and other cars would queue behind. Referring to Exhibit A-2, he demonstrated how the cars will enter via the westerly driveway and proceed through the angled parking area and then proceed to the westerly side of the building near the cross walk. The vehicle circulation is one way in, one way out. All of the design elements meet the NJDOT design criteria. One element is a recirculation aisle at the northerly end of the parking field. The applicant proposes one handicap parking space.

Mr. Cook wanted to know if the driveway was wide enough to allow another car to drive out. Mr. Dean answered yes, it consists of two lanes that are each 12 feet wide.

Madam Chair wanted to know what provisions have been made for parking for special events. Mr. Dean answered that the special events will be held off site. Madam Chair asked if the queue exceeds the available space, what will happen? Mr. Dean answered that it will spill out onto Route 22.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS:

There were no questions from the public for this witness.

Eric Trepkau stated that he has a degree in architecture. He was licensed in New Jersey in 2000 and practices in Clinton, New Jersey.

Mr. Trepkau described the design of the building. There is a front porch. Upon entering there is a secured greeting area. There is a small office. A hallway runs the length of the building. One half of the building will be designated for K-1 program and the other half for the K-2 program. Both classrooms are connected with a mutual coat room. There is also a shared lavatory space. They proposed a small teacher's prep. Room. At the end of the hallway is a studio area that will be used for a multi purpose space for projects or presentations. There is a small kitchenette and closets. They propose a small deck to descend to the play area.

Exhibit A-4 – Front elevation.

Mr. Trepkau stated that there will be a basement for the mechanical equipment.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS:

There were no questions from the public for this witness.

Mr. Serra continued with Mr. Sullivan's report. Regarding section 7.53 – sidewalk along the south of the building, the applicant will agree to this condition. There is a stockade fence along the southerly line, and they propose to construct a fence running north to south. That will enclose the entire play area. Regarding section 7.54 it references sidewalks on the highway and he would not be in favor of installing it. Mr. Klotz stated that there is going to be a senior development next to this site. He felt that a sidewalk would be warranted.

Exhibit A-5 Sheet one of three of the site plan

Exhibit A-6 – Front elevation

Mrs. Duffy stated that the playground area is shown on the plan indicating the buffer located behind it. She wanted to know why they couldn't install a fence to keep the children in the playground area and out of the buffer area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Terryann Carballal 35 Abraham Road wanted to know if the Whitehouse School had a fence around their play area. Madam Chair stated that the Planning Board does not have jurisdiction over the school.

Mr. Clerico addressed the matter of landscaping 10% of the surface area of the parking lot. He stated that they would have to meet with the professionals to determine how this will be calculated.

Mr. Serra addressed Mr. Sullivan's report regarding the lighting and they will revisit this

area. The lights are proposed to be turned off by 8:00 p.m. minus the safety lights. The applicant will comply with the remainder of Mr. Sullivan's report.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Tom Doyle stated that he is the former owner of the property. He praised the applicant and supported the application.

Terryann Carballal stated that she supports the application.

Tiffany Barka 139 Whitehouse Avenue supports the application.

Madam Chair announced that this matter will be carried to February 11, 2008.

L. ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Monaco made a motion to adjourn. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz