

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
REORGANIZATION AND REGULAR MEETING
January 13, 2020**

The Meeting was called to order by Kathryn Razin, Esq. at 7:00 p.m. stating that the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act have been met and that this meeting had been duly advertised.

SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBERS

Attorney Razin swore in new members as follows prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Jonathan Heller
John Albanese
Cheryl Filler
Adam Mueller
Tanya Rohrbach (Alternate#1)

ROLL CALL

Board Members in Attendance:

Albanese, J.
Allen, J.
Cook, J.
Duffy, E.
Filler, C.
Heller, J.
Mueller, A.
John, C.
Monaco, R.
Rohrbach, T.

Others Present

Attorney Kathryn Razin Esq. for Board Attorney Jonathan Drill, Esq., Bord Planner Michael Sullivan, Board Engineer John Hansen, Board Environmental Consultant Jack Szczepanski, Board Conflict Traffic Engineer Walter Lublanecki and Board Secretary Ann Marie Lehberger

NOMINATION AND ELECTION

Nomination of Board Chair

Ms. Filler moved, and Mr. Albanese seconded a motion to appoint Ron Monaco as the Board Chair for 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Monaco took over the meeting.

Nomination of Board Vice Chair

Ms. Filler moved, and Mr. Albanese seconded a motion to appoint Liz Duffy as the Board Vice Chair for 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

Nomination of Board Vice Chair Pro Temp

Ms. Duffy moved, and Mr. Albanese seconded a motion to appoint Cheryl Filler as the Board Vice Chair Pro Temp for 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

Nomination of Board Secretary

Ms. Duffy moved, and Mr. Albanese seconded a motion to appoint Ann Marie Lehberger as the Board Secretary for 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

SELECTION OF BOARD PROFESSIONALS

Board Attorney – Jonathan E. Drill, Esq. Stickel Koenig Sullivan & Drill, LLC

Board Planner – Michael Sullivan, Clarke Caton Hintz

Board Engineer (January 2020)–John Hansen, Engineering & Land Planning Associates Inc.

Traffic Engineer – Jay Troutman, McDonough & Rea Associates

Materials Testing Company – Key-Tech Laboratories

Environmental Consultants – Princeton Hydro

Acoustical Consultants – The Noise Consultancy LLC

Conflict Engineer – Mott MacDonald LLC

Conflict Traffic Engineer – Walter Lublanecki, Lublanecki Engineering Inc.

Ms. Filler moved, and Mr. Cook seconded a motion to approve the Board Professionals for 2020. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF CALENDAR FOR 2020

Ms. Duffy moved, and Mr. Albanese seconded a motion to approve the 2020 calendar. The motion carried unanimously.

SELECTION OF TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Ms. Allen, Ms. Filler, Mr. John, and Mr. Monaco volunteered for the 2020 technical review committee.

SELECTION OF NEWSPAPERS FOR PUBLICATION

Hunterdon County Democrat

Hunterdon Review

Courier News

Star Ledger

Express Times

Ms. Filler moved, and Mr. Albanese seconded a motion to approve the newspapers. The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION #2019-12

Resolution memorializing recommendation that Block 36, Lots 4, 5, 5.02 & 5.04 be designated as a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment pursuant to the local redevelopment and housing law, N.J.S.A 40A:12A-1 ET SEQ.

Mr. Albanese moved, and Ms. Filler seconded, a motion to adopt Resolution#2019-12. The roll call vote follows:

Member	Motion	2 nd	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Not Eligible	Recused
Albanese	X		X					
Allen			X					
Cook								X
Filler		X	X					
Heller							X	
John			X					
Mueller							X	
Duffy			X					
Monaco			X					
Rohrbach							X	

RESOLUTION# 2019-13

Resolution memorializing recommendation that Block 36, Lots 65 & 66 be designated as a condemnation area in need of redevelopment pursuant to the local redevelopment and housing law, N.J.S.A 40A:12A-1 ET SEQ.

Ms. Filler moved, and Ms. Duffy seconded, a motion to adopt Resolution 2019-13. The roll call vote follows:

Member	Motion	2 nd	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Not Eligible	Recused
Albanese			X					
Allen			X					
Cook								X
Filler	X		X					
Heller							X	
John			X					
Mueller							X	
Duffy		X	X					
Monaco			X					
Rohrbach							X	

PUBLIC HEARING

Readington Commons II, LLC
 Appl# PB19-006- Block 4, Lots 51 & 52, 458-460 Route 22
 Preliminary Major Site Plan with Variances -Hunterdon Heights at Readington multi-family residential apartment development

Ronald Shimanowitz, Esq. was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Shimanowitz explained that the applicant was seeking Preliminary Major Site Plan approval with bulk variances and design exceptions for a multi-family residential community. He described the

site and provided an overview as follows: The proposal is for 254 multi-family rental units of which 190 units are market units and 64 are affordable units. There are 9 buildings proposed, two will be elevator served and the remaining seven will be walkups. The site is already developed with office buildings and other site improvements. The plan is to demolish two of the existing office buildings, remove the five existing building slabs and convert one of the existing buildings to a recreation center. Mr. Shimanowitz noted that this application was the subject of a settlement agreement between the Township and the applicant that occurred within the declaratory judgement action as part of the Township's affordable housing compliance.

The following individuals were also present and sworn in for the applicant:

Michael Pucci, PE, applicant's engineer

Thomas Auffenorde, PWS, applicant's environmental consultant

Douglas Polyniak, PE, applicant's traffic engineer

Robert Larsen, RA, PP, applicant's architect and planner

Exhibits presented:

- A-1 Aerial Map of Site
- A-2 Color Rendering of Overall Site Plan
- A-3 Revised Tree Species Chart dated 1/13/20
- A-4 Cut and Fill Exhibit
- A-5 Overall Grading Plan
- A-6 3-D Perspective- Garden Apartment
- A-7 3-D Perspective – 3 Story- Elevator
- A-8 3-D Perspective -Recreation Center
- A-9 View of Pool Area
- A-10 Signage Location Map
- A-11 3-D Perspective- Site Aerial
- A-12 Elevations- Multi-Family Elevator

Board Planner Michael Sullivan, Board Engineer John Hansen, Board Environmental Consultant Jack Szczepanski and Board Conflict Traffic Engineer Walter Lublanecki were also sworn.

Michael Pucci, PE, the applicant's engineer was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Pucci gave an overview of the existing conditions on the site and provided testimony as follows: Lot 51 consists of the existing Readington Commons office complex and lot 52 is currently underdeveloped. The proposed development will utilize the existing driveway for a boulevard entrance to the site. The drainage pattern on the site will be altered as part of the proposal. Currently everything on the site drains to the existing retention pond and this will continue for the proposed buildings and improvements in the front of the site. The proposed buildings and parking that will be constructed in the back of the development will go to a new drainage system. The applicant has applied to the DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) for all the applicable permits. There is existing sanitary sewer on site that currently serves the three-existing buildings that comes from Route 22. This

will be adequate to handle what is being proposed. There is also an existing water line that comes into the site. The applicant met with NJ American Water who indicated that there is adequate pressure and adequate capacity to serve the development. NJ American Water is requiring the installation of a hot box that will be placed 50 feet from the Route 22 right of way. A variance is required for the hot box. There are buildings that are proposed as part of the new development that will be built within the 350- foot stream corridor buffer however none of the disturbance occurs in native land or undisturbed area. It all occurs within previously disturbed area from the existing office complex. A variance is being requested for the installation of a dog run for the development that extends 7.5 feet into the stream corridor buffer. A variance is also required for the 5 x 5 emergency access egress pads that are proposed in front of the exit doors for buildings 5, 7 & 8.

The Board questioned what the size of the dog run was. Mr. Pucci noted that is was 50 feet by 135 feet.

The Board questioned if management would be on site. Mr. Pucci explained that there would four maintenance people and two leasing agents on site.

The Board asked for clarification on the dog park. Mr. Pucci explained that is a fenced in area with a double gate entry but noted that the specific details and features have yet to be determined.

Chairman Monaco opened the public portion of the meeting for questions of Mr. Pucci on his testimony thus far.

Frank Leshik of Abraham Road was present and noted that there is currently a flooding problem on Route 22 west near the proposed development and expressed concern about how the proposed change in topography will affect the water discharge on the site.

Bob Krupnik of 4 Miller Lane was present and questioned the direction of the water flow from the property and if there will be any increase in water flow as a result of the new development. Mr. Krupnik also questioned if there was a plan on how the residents would exit the development in the event Route 22 west was closed during a heavy rainstorm.

Mr. Pucci discussed the variances the applicant was requesting as follows:

- Side yard buffer width
- Accessory building and structure in front yard
- Stream corridor disturbance
- Wall height in side yard
- Fence height in side yard
- Change in grade exceeding two vertical feet
- Lot percentage of topographic change
- Maximum slope transition

Mr. Pucci continued his testimony as follows: There is currently existing development on the site that is within the stream corridor buffer. The proposal will also have development within the 350- foot stream corridor buffer that requires relief from ordinance however there will be no new disturbance; it is all within the previously disturbed area.

The Board questioned how something could be built in the riparian zone. Mr. Pucci explained that he did not know since he was not part of the original application for the office park. He did note that there were stream reclassifications that occurred in 2004 and 2009 that could have affected the buffer requirements.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Pucci confirmed that the applicant's proposal does not use all the previously disturbed area.

Mr. Pucci continued his testimony as follows: A retaining wall with a fence on top is proposed around the new detention basin. The fence is there for safety. Mr. Pucci presented an exhibit (A-4) that illustrated the extent of grade change on the project that is needed due to the nature of the site. The overall site is 17.1 acres. The area of grade change that is above the 2-foot differential for cut is 1.25 acres and for fill is 1.38 acres.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Pucci, referencing exhibit (A-5), described how the water is expected to flow on the lot.

The Board asked if any green infrastructure was being used. Mr. Pucci explained that for now it is maintaining the existing vegetated perimeters as much as possible and not disturbing the wetland components and riparian corridors around the basins.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Pucci explained that a Stormwater Management and Maintenance Manual was provided with the application that outlines the requirements and obligations to maintain the storm water system. Mr. Pucci noted that there will be maintenance people onsite to ensure that the requirements are being met.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Pucci confirmed that there would not be any water flow to the existing residential home in the northeast corner of the property.

The Board questioned if the retaining wall would be visible from Route 22. Mr. Pucci noted that there will be a significant buffer of trees.

With respect to trees on the site, Mr. Pucci explained that they located all the trees on site by size, species and location. He noted that 1,066 trees will be removed, of which 2 are 24 inches in height and everything else is 18 inches in height or less.

Chair Monaco opened the public portion of the meeting for questions of Mr. Pucci on his testimony thus far. There were no questions from the public.

Mr. Pucci reviewed the exceptions that the applicant is requesting as follows:

- Change in wall plane along building facades
- Parking Area Illumination
- Illumination at Property Line
- Lighting Mounting Height
- Residential Building Sign Area
- Trash Enclosure Design
- Residential buffer design – canopy trees
- Street tree
- Parking area shade trees
- Parking area screening
- Parking area islands
- Pedestrian/vehicle separation

Mr. Pucci explained that the applicant is proposing a height of 20 feet for the light poles, where 16 feet is required by ordinance in order to reduce the number of light poles needed on site. Mr. Pucci also noted that the light poles would be shielded.

The Board noted that the lighting pole location plan should be coordinated with the landscape plan.

Mr. Pucci noted that the applicant will work with the Board's professionals to add crosswalks at appropriate locations to maintain a safe circulation flow throughout the property.

The Board agreed to grant a waiver for street trees rather than require the applicant to install them along Route 22 in the riparian zone.

In response to a question from the Board Engineer, John Hansen, Mr. Pucci confirmed that the solid waste and recycling areas that are proposed are more than adequate to serve all the units in the development.

The Board expressed concern about the distance that residents will need to walk to dispose of their garbage and recycling.

Chair Monaco opened the public portion of the meeting for questions of Mr. Pucci. There were no questions from the public.

Robert Larsen, RA, PP, the applicant's architect was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Larsen explained that nine structures are being proposed as part of the application. Two of the structures are elevator buildings and seven of the structures are traditional walkup garden apartment buildings. Mr. Larsen provided testimony as follows: The garden apartment buildings are three story wood frame structures containing 168 units. 114 are market rental units and the remaining 54 are affordable units. The market units include 38 1- bedroom, and 76 2-bedroom units. The affordable units include 12 1- bedroom, 30 2-bedroom and 12 3-bedroom units. The buildings are sprinklered and have

an entrance to a common area. The units on the third floor are accessed from the second floor. The buildings have front and rear access with common storage areas. All first-floor units are handicap accessible. The elevator buildings are three story single point of entry with an elevator lobby and stair exits on each side of the building. There is mixture of stone, panel and siding on all the buildings. There are 43 units in each building for 86 in total, 76 are market units and 10 are affordable units. The market units include 20 1-bedroom and 56 2-bedroom units. The affordable units include 9 2-bedroom and 1 3-bedroom units. These buildings have trash and recycle chutes on each floor. They are fully sprinklered and handicap accessible. There is also out of unit storage areas as required by ordinance. The total number of units for the entire site is 254, 190 market and 64 affordable. The total for the affordable units includes 12 1-bedroom, 39 2-bedroom and 13 3-bedroom units. One of the existing office buildings will be repurposed for a recreation center and will have similar architecture as the other buildings. The outside of the recreation center will have a pool area and a gathering area. There will be a gym, game room, parcel delivery area and leasing center inside the recreation building. A new entrance sign is proposed that will have the name of the development on it. A hot box building is proposed to make the required hot box look more aesthetically pleasing. Wayfinding signage and building mounting number signs are also proposed.

To answer a previous question from the Board, Mr. Larsen explained that the only deference between this plan and the concept plan that is attached to the ordinance is the flow of the entrance drive.

Mr. Larsen noted that a single building mounted light fixture is proposed over each of the entry doors on the buildings as well as a small building mounting scone at each patio.

The Board questioned where the mailboxes would be. Mr. Larsen noted that there would be cluster style boxes out in front of each building.

The Board questioned if there was visitor parking. Mr. Larsen explained that visitor parking is built into the RSIS (Residential Site Improvement Standards) requirements.

The Board questioned if bike paths would be on the roadways. Mr. Larsen noted there would not be bike paths, but bike racks will be provided.

The Board asked if there would be electric car chargers. Mr. Larsen noted that there would be.

The Board questioned if they considered solar. Mr. Larsen noted that the applicant was not considering solar.

The Board questioned if sidewalks would be installed on Route 22. Mr. Larsen noted that there are no sidewalks proposed.

The Board questioned if the elevators will be used as a means of egress. Mr. Larsen noted that there are stairwells that will be used.

The Board questioned where the storage area would be located for the walk-up buildings. Mr. Larsen indicated it would be located on the ground floor as well as the second floor.

The Board expressed concern about storage for families with children who would be living on the third floor using strollers and other toys that would need to be stored.

Mr. Larsen noted that this is a very widely used building style in the industry.

The Board asked where a similar designed layout building is located. Mr. Larsen noted there is one in Monroe Township that is identical to the ones proposed.

The Board asked what the highest height on the buildings was. Mr., Larsen estimated it was around 50 feet.

The Board expressed concern about the location of the play areas near the parking areas for safety reasons.

The Board questioned if there would be crosswalks for safe passing. Mr. Larsen stated that they would work to create safe passages for pedestrians.

The Board expressed concern about the size of the pool being adequate for the number of residents.

The Board questioned if there will be outdoor picnic areas. Mr. Larsen noted that they intend to develop the open green area behind the pavilion with picnic tables and grills.

The Bord questioned if the units would be sub metered. Mr. Larsen stated that they would be. The Board expressed concern about there being enough storage for the electrical equipment.

The Board questioned if there would be adequate lighting for the trash areas in the evening. Mr. Pucci returned and noted that there would be lighting in the parking area that would be more than adequate for getting to the trash enclosures.

Chair Monaco opened the public portion of the meeting for questions of Mr. Larsen.

Frank Leshik of Abraham Road was present and expressed concern about there being a demand for the proposed units.

Douglas Polyniak, PE, the applicant's traffic engineer was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Polyniak noted that as per section 5:21-4.16E of the RSIS (Residential Improvement Standards), the applicant meets the intent of the RSIS by providing a divided

type entrance to allow access to the dwelling units solely via a parking lot and also by allowing a two way flow with a secondary means of access for emergency vehicles.

The Board questioned if the site could be accessed through the center median when traveling on Route 22 east. Mr. Polyniak confirmed that it could.

The Board questioned if cars would be able to exit the site if there was flooding to the west on Route 22. Mr. Polyniak confirmed that cars could exit through the median break but noted that it would require control by police if that occurred.

The Board expressed concern about residents exiting the site when there is flooding on the westbound side of Route 22 noting that it happens frequently during heavy rainstorms.

The Board questioned if the location of the driveway could be relocated or widened. Mr. Pucci returned and explained that due to the riparian zone on both sides that this is the only location to put the driveway.

Mr. Shimanowitz explained that the applicant would be willing to pursue some type of emergency plan through speaking with DOT and the police to see what can be done.

Chair Monaco requested that the applicant reach out to DOT and the police prior to the next meeting.

It was announced that the application would be carried to the meeting on February 10, 2020 at 7:00 pm with no further notice.

It was noted that the applicant's engineer would not be present at the meeting on February 10, 2020.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion- Readington Hop Farm Ordinance Subcommittee

Chair Monaco suggested that there be a subcommittee to review the draft ordinance and comments that were received from the Brewery. Ms. Filler, Ms. Allen and Mr. Heller volunteered to be on the subcommittee with the Chairman.

The Board secretary will schedule a meeting.

Sewer Service Area Amendment Request – Readington Commons II, LLC- Hunterdon Heights at Readington, Block 4 Lots 51 & 52

Chair Monaco explained that the Board received a request from the applicant to amend the sewer service area in the zone to include lots 51 & 52

Ms. Filler moved, and Ms. Duffy seconded, a motion to approve the request to amend the sewer service area and confirm that it is not inconsistent with the Master Plan. The roll call vote follows:

Member	Motion	2nd	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Not Eligible	Recused
Albanese			X					
Allen			X					
Cook			X					
Filler	X		X					
Heller					X			
John			X					
Mueller					X			
Duffy		X	X					
Monaco			X					
Rohrbach							X	

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cook moved, and Ms. Filler seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
 Ann Marie Lehberger
 Planning Board Secretary