

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES  
September 22, 2008**

**A. Chairman Flynn called the meeting to order at 7:34 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:**

<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>Mr. Getz</b>	<b>absent</b>
<b>Mr. Klotz</b>	<b>absent</b>
<b>Mr. Monaco</b>	<b>absent</b>
<b>Mr. Smith</b>	<b>absent</b>
<b>Madam Chair</b>	<b>present</b>

**Mrs. Fort – Board of Adjustment member**

**Valerie Kimson, Esq., Purcell, Ries, Shannon, Mulcahy & O’Neill**

**H. Clay McEldowney – Hatch, Mott & McDonald**

**Brent Krasner – Clark, Caton & Hintz**

**Dr. Clay Emerson – Princeton Hydro**

**C. MINUTES**

**1. September 8, 2008 Mr. Cook made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. *Motion* was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded*.**

**D. CORRESPONDENCE:**

**Regarding the memo from the Historic Preservation Commission, a memo will be forwarded to them indicating that the firm of Clark, Caton and Hintz is working on revising the ordinance and they will take their comments under advisement.**

**Mr. McEldowney reported on his letter to the county regarding bridge Number RQ-164, he stated that there could be some changes in the amount of paving. The Board was clear that they do not want a road that is in Readington Township’s jurisdiction to be paved by the county. Also, the board does not want the road elevated.**

**Mrs. Allen wanted Mr. McEldowney to investigate the site distance at the bridge. Julia Allen and Cheryl Filler volunteered to serve on a subcommittee and to meet with Mr. McEldowney when he meets with the county engineer.**

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

**E. VOUCHER APPROVAL**

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

**F. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

- 1 Janet Rollero/Healthy U Personal Training, Inc.  
Block 21.01, Lot 8  
Minor site plan  
Action Date: October 18, 2008**

**Mrs. Filler made a motion to deem the application complete and to grant the waivers as requested for completeness purposes only. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.**

**G. RESOLUTIONS:**

- 1 American Classics, LLC  
Final Major Subdivision  
Block 69, Lot 12**

**Mrs. Allen made a motion to approve the resolution. Mr. Cook seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call:**

<b>Mrs. Allen</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Cook</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mrs. Filler</b>	<b>aye</b>

- 2. Wilmark  
Block 25, Lot 38.01  
Request for extension**

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

**Roll Call:**

<b>Mrs. Filler</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Madam Chair</b>	<b>aye</b>

- 3. Michael Eng  
Block 97, Lots 2 & 2.32  
Request for extension of approval**

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

**Roll Call:**

Mr. Cook                    aye  
Mrs. Duffy                 aye  
Mrs. Filler                 aye  
Madam Chair aye

**H. EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

**RESOLUTION  
(Open Public Meetings Act – Executive Session)**

**WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 2:4-12, Open Public Meetings Act, permits the exclusion of the public from a meeting in certain circumstances; and**

**WHEREAS, this public body is of the opinion that such circumstances presently exist:**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Planning Board, the Township of Readington, County of Hunterdon, State of New Jersey, as follows:

**The public shall be excluded from discussion of the hereinafter specified subject matters. The general nature of the subject matter to be discussed is as follows:**

**1. Liardo v. Readington Township Planning Board**

**It is anticipated at this time that the contents of the above discussions will remain confidential.**

**This Resolution shall take effect immediately.**

**Certified to be a true copy of a Resolution adopted on September 22, 2008**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Linda Jacukowicz, Coordinator**

**Mrs. Filler made a motion to enter executive session at 7:49 p.m. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded.***

**Mrs. Filler made a motion to enter open session at 8:05 p.m. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded.***

**I. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 1. Tom Jr. Properties  
Preliminary Major Subdivision  
Block 36, Lot 7  
1 Railroad Lane  
Action Date: October 9, 2008**

**Mr. Cook recused himself from participating in the hearing.**

**In order to reach a quorum, Betty Ann Fort a member of the Zoning Board of Adjustment participated at the Planning Board.**

**Mr. Fox stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. His office is in Chester, New Jersey.**

**He stated that the applicant is proposing to subdivide the property into four building lots. They are seeking one variance which would be to allow the construction of a roadway within 50 feet of the property line.**

**Attorney Kimson swore in all of the witnesses, including the board's professionals.**

**Robert Zederbaum stated that he is a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey. He was licensed in the State of New Jersey in 1978.**

**Exhibit A-1 Sheet 3 of 12 of the plan revised date of 01-04-08.**

**Mr. Zederbaum testified that regarding the location of the driveway for lot 7.03, they will shift the driveway thereby eliminating the need for a variance. That change will be reflected on the revised plans. The only variance that the applicant is requesting is for the location of the road servicing the property which is closer to the tract boundary than what is permitted by the ordinance.**

**A-2 Sheet 4 of 12 of the plan revised date of 01-04-08**

**The property consists of approximately 22 acres. They are proposing to subdivide 3 lots and a remaining lot contains an existing house. The lots are fully conforming. The property is in the RR zone. The minimum lot size requirement in this zone is 3 acres and the contiguous useable area requirement for those lots is 65,000 square feet. A large portion of the property will be placed in a conservation easement. The property will be served by sewers and private wells.**

**Along Central Railroad Lane an easement is owned by New Jersey Water Authority. This has been designated for the construction of a major water main.**

**A-3 Title sheet**

**Mr. Krasner stated that there was a discrepancy on the plat between the lot sizes on the plat and the lot sizes listed in the table. Mr. Zederbaum answered that the lot sizes listed on the plat are the correct numbers. He will update the chart.**

**Based upon the comments from Mr. McEldowney and Mr. Sullivan concerning the conservation easement, Mr. Zederbaum stated that when they develop the property they would eliminate the crossing and would provide the conservation easement. By moving the proposed property boundary between lot 7.03 and lot 7 in a northerly direction, they can provide sufficient useable area. The size of the useable contiguous area on the remaining lands falls below the required 65,000 square feet. The useable land is approximately 53,000 square feet.**

**A-4 Conceptual plan dated September 22, 2008**

**Mrs. Flynn stated that she would rather have 2 substandard lots thereby creating fewer disturbances.**

**Presently they show a retaining wall located along the common property southern boundary. This structure was constructed to protect the lot from the roadway system.**

**Mr. Krasner stated that Lot 8 shares the existing driveway with the adjacent lot. Mr. Zederbaum answered that was correct and that there is no legal right to that shared driveway. However there is road access for Lot 8. Mr. Fox stated that the applicant would have no problem creating an easement for Lot 8 to be able to use the driveway.**

**Mr. McEldowney informed the board that there is an issue with the detention basin on the concept plan. The detention basin will be in full view. The basin should be out of view or the applicant should install an alternative to an open detention basin.**

**Dr. Emerson stated that the site has tremendous environmental resources. The concept that is proposed is more acceptable from an environmental standpoint. However, there are other difficulties with the layout. The detention basin is "show cast" as an entrance piece.**

**Mr. Fox suggested that Mr. Zederbaum meet with Princeton Hydro and Hatch, Mott and McDonald prior to the next hearing.**

**Madam Chair stated that at this point the stormwater issues are so overwhelming that rather than proceeding, they have to adjourn and meet with the professionals and return with a revised plan.**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Elizabeth Dembeski wanted to know where the location of the driveway would be located for the rear lot. Mr. Zederbaum answered that there will be no driveway to the back lot. The proposed location of the house will be moved forward.**

**David (inaudible) Block 36, Lot 16 was concerned about the runoff from the wetlands. Mr. Zederbaum stated that based upon his design the water will be collected by the swales that are located on both sides of the proposed subdivision road and will be collected in the detention basin.**

**Bob Smith, Block 36, lot 6 wanted to know how they propose to change the runoff that currently runs behind his house. Mr. Zederbaum stated that most of the water that will be running across that lot would be from the structure. They are proposing to collect that water into drywells.**

**Jerry Cook 5 Railroad Lane – (Attorney Kimson qualified Mr. Cook as a member of the Planning Board that right now is speaking on behalf as a resident) He wanted to know why the applicant used the term dry well. Mr. Zederbaum answered that they originally considered the construction of dry wells, but now due to the results of the soil testing, they have decided not to construct them.**

**Madam Chair referred to Dr. Emerson's report wherein he mentioned that the runoff would be increased due to the proposed construction. The proposed stormwater management plan does not address the volume control. Dr. Emerson stated regarding the proposed plan, it does not meet ordinance standards.**

**Mr. Krasner informed the board that he was concerned about having development located in the rear half of the site which is the most severely constrained. There is also sizeable wetland in the**

front of the site. He recommended a conservation easement on all of the wetlands. From a visual character standpoint, he did not recommend locating the detention basin in the front. He recommended other alternatives.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Elizabeth Dembeski wanted the board to know that everyone is upset because the applicant has approval for 4 sewer unit connections.

Mr. Fox answered the board that the applicant was given 7 sewer connections by the Superior Court Appellate Division of New Jersey.

Bob Smith was concerned about the children's safety around the detention basin.

Steve Albrecht was concerned about stormwater runoff going across his back yard. Mr. Zederbaum stated that the runoff will travel away from his house. During final grading they will make sure that water is not creating problems to surrounding property owners.

Mrs. Fort stated that present conditions cannot be improved, but the professionals will make sure that they are not made worse.

This matter is carried to November 11, 2008.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to adjourn at 9:17 p.m. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz