

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
September 25, 2006**

A. Chairman Flynn called the meeting to order and announced that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act had been met and that the meeting had been duly advertised. The Board saluted the flag.

B. Members and professionals present:

Mrs. Allen	present
Mr. Auriemma	present
Mr. Cook	present
Mrs. Duffy	present
Mrs. Filler	present
Mrs. Flynn	present
Mr. Klotz	present
Mr. Monaco	present
Mr. Smith	present

**Michael Sullivan, Clarke-Caton & Hintz
Valerie Kimson, Esq., Purcell, Ries, Shannon, Mulcahy & O'Neill
H. Clay McEldowney, Studer & McEldowney**

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. September 11, 2006 – Mr. Cook made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Auriemma seconded the motion. *Motion* was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded*.

D. CORRESPONDENCE:

Mrs. Filler brought the board's attention to the correspondence received from the Hunterdon County Planning Board referencing the changes to the proposed preliminary State Plan Map dated September 5, 2006. Mrs. Allen suggested that the board should advise the Hunterdon County Planning Board that the Readington Township Planning Board stands by the original submission that was the result of the Cross Acceptance work that took place last year. The Township Committee will be copied on this memo and the Planning Board is requesting that they should also forward the same memo to the Hunterdon County Planning Board upholding the original submission of last year.

E. RESOLUTIONS:

1. New Cingular Wireless

**Block 46, lot 14.03
Amendment to resolution**

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to approve the resolution. Mr. Auriemma seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

- 2. Shabbecong, LLC
Minor Subdivision
38 Forty Second Street
Block 48, lot 10**

This matter is carried to the next meeting.

- 3. Ominpoint Communications, Inc.
Preliminary Site Plan
Block 20, lot 6**

Mr. Klotz made a motion to approve the resolution. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

- 4. Darren Pincus
Conditional Use
Block 63, lot 53.05**

This matter is carried to the next meeting.

- 5. Emmet
Amended Minor Subdivision
Block 12.01, lot 14.01 and 15**

This matter is carried to the next meeting.

- 6. Nelson & Natalie Ferreira
Amended Site Plan
Block 39, lot 53.17, 61.04**

This matter is carried to the next meeting.

F. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

- 1. Rockaway Creek, LLC
Preliminary Major Site Plan
Block 39, lot 57
Action date: October 15, 2006**

Mrs. Filler stated that the TRC determined that the application is incomplete.

G. OLD BUSINESS:

None

H. VOUCHER APPROVAL

**Mrs. Filler 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.***

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. Ernest E. & Elizabeth Renda
Minor Subdivision
Block 64, lot 19
Action date: signed extension and carried to October 10, 2006**

Madam Chair announced that this matter was carried to October 10, 2006 and that there would be no further notice.

- 2 Wilmark Building Contractors
Final Major Subdivision
Block 25, lot 38.01
Signed extension and carried to September 25, 2006**

Madam Chair announced that this matter was carried to October 10, 2006 and that there would be no further notice.

J. OTHER BUSINESS:

- 1. Hearing Notices**

Mrs. Duffy stated that years ago it was the policy of the board to make applicant's re-notice when there have been 3 adjournments. She stated that if anyone had an interest in the carried application, after this period of time the public is unaware of it. Attorney Kimson stated that she would review the board's By-Laws and report to the board at the next meeting.

- 2. Floor Area Ratio Ordinance discussion**

Beth McManus of Clark, Caton and Hintz presented to the board floor area ratio calculations depending on the lot size and building area. She stated that the floor area ratio means the percentage of the lot that is occupied by the building area, including the first floor and any subsequent floors. It also includes accessory buildings too. The purpose of the presentation was to address the FAR in the 3 largest lot zones; Steep Slope Residential, (SSR) Agriculture/Residential (AR) and Rural Residential (RR).

Ms. McManus read the gross floor area definition to the board. She stated that if a resident wanted to add an addition to their home, they have to count all livable space, including their basement, attic and porch as floor area. She stated that the board has to determine if they want to amend the definition of gross floor area.

Mrs. Allen informed everyone that during the sub-committee meetings, it was discussed to exclude basement and attics generically and not include porches or decks, but do include garages and sheds. One of the things that this amendment is trying to do is to prevent excesses.

Ms. McManus recapped for the board: for FAR the board will include all floor area in the house except for that area which is unfinished, or uninhabitable, therefore including finished basements and finished attics, but excluding unfinished

basement or attic that is used for storage. However, they are including all floor area regardless of what it is used for in any accessory structure.

After discussion it was determined to exclude basements and unfinished attics from the calculations, but including finished attics.

Ms. McManus referred to the handout sheet. She stated that some of the other ideas were to establish a minimum floor area that every resident is entitled to. For example, if someone had a ½ acre lot and the FAR is 10% you would only be entitled to a house that is less than 2200 square feet. By establishing a minimum floor area that all homes are entitled to maybe 3500 or 4500 square feet, that would give this ½ acre property owner the ability to bypass the FAR regulation and go immediately to comply with the guaranteed floor area. They could also do a cap to the floor areas. For example, if you have a 5 acre lot and the FAR is 10%, this would be capped at 10,500 or 12,000 square feet, as opposed to the nearly 22,000 square feet of building area that you would be permitted with a 10% FAR.

Mr. Monaco stated that 10% is a good number for the middle, which is why he agrees with having the “floor and ceiling” numbers.

Mrs. Flynn stated that many homes have small lots and they do not have a reserve septic bed. So if they have a deck, pool and shed in the back yard, there is no place for a new septic. This type of application would have to go to the Board of Adjustment. Therefore, she would agree to have the smaller FAR for those lots. She would be more inclined to 8% for the smaller lots.

Ms. McManus informed the board that they could impose different “caps” based on lot area. For example a 3,000 square foot cap would be appropriate for a ½ acre lot and a 4,000 square foot cap would be appropriate for a 1 acre lot. The board would not be bound by having “one floor” and “one ceiling”.

Mr. Monaco stated that you never just have 1 acre. You would have to figure out what would you do with the in between numbers.

Ms. McManus stated that she created a scale with approximately 20 FAR's running from 1 acres to 6 acres. It became very complicated. She suggested going with the graduated schedule and staying with the floor area as opposed FAR.

Mrs. Allen informed the board that another reason for having the minimum is now we have the net area. No one wants the zoning officer to require someone to do wetlands delineation on 1 ¾ acre lot because they want to construct a recreation room at the rear of the house.

Mr. Klotz asked what Ms. McManus felt would be a good minimum number. She responded by saying that the subcommittee's opinion was 4,500 square feet

guaranteed minimum floor area in all homes. They included 10,500, 12,000, 15, 000 square feet, which only applies to the larger lots.

Mrs. Allen stated that the way the ordinance stands, everyone in the AR zone that wanted to construct something on their lot, would have to go to the Board of Adjustment.

Ms. McManus recommended that the ordinance would read for example: "...10% FAR or 8% FAR all lots should guaranteed a minimum of 4,500 square feet for lots 6 acres or less, there will be a cap of 10,500 square feet. For 6 acres and greater the FAR would be 4%, no cap..."

Mr. Monaco stated that before this is approved, he would like to have the square footage numbers for some of the mansions in Stanton Ridge.

Ms. McManus recapped: 8% FAR across the board provided you have the minimum floor area. At about 3 acres you start to reach the cap of 10,500 square feet. Then for 6.1 acres and above, it would be 4% FAR.

Ms. McManus stated that her office would obtain the information regarding the house sizes in Stanton Ridge. If the existing house sizes in that area, fit with this analysis, they will prepare a draft ordinance. If they are radically out of sic then they will come back for additional information.

K. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz