

**Washington Township Planning Board
May 22, 2013**

Vice Chairman Mont called the regular meeting of May 22, 2013 of the Washington Township Planning Board to order at 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

CLASS IV: Charles DiSalvo, Lou Mont, Mark Bauerlein Kathleen McGroarty,
Eric Trevena

ALTERNATES: Sam Akin

CLASS I: -

CLASS II: Roger Read

CLASS III: James LiaBraaten

ABSENT: Ken Short, Howard Popper, William Leavens

OTHERS PRESENT: Attorney Buzak, Engineer Hall. Traffic Engineer Maltz, Planner Banisch,
Clerk Margolese

Adequate notice of this meeting was sent to the Observer-Tribune on January 17, 2013 and posted on the Bulletin Board on the same date. Notices were mailed as per requests.

MINUTES

Minutes from the April 24, 2013 & May 13, 2013 Regular Meeting

There were not enough eligible voters to vote on these minutes so the vote was tabled.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON AGENDA ITEMS

The meeting was opened to the public for items not on the agenda. There were no questions or comments from the public and the meeting was closed to the public.

PUBLIC HEARING/APPLICATIONS

1. Kings Highway Investment Company, LLC – Block 30, Lots 70, 70.01 & 70.02

214 Kings Highway - R-20 Zone – 42 Acres

Conceptual Plan for Multi Family Housing Units

Representatives present: Michael Selvaggi, Esq., Traffic Consultant Craig Peregoy

Attorney Michael Selvaggi reintroduced the proposed project to the Board and noted that this is a continuation of the conceptual plan hearing from the April 24th meeting. Traffic Engineer Harold Maltz told the Board that prior to his May 17, 2013 report he had had a dialog with Kings Highway's Traffic consultant Craig Peregoy. He stated that Mr. Peregoy had sent two spreadsheets of data that he had appended to his report. Mr. Maltz stated that Mr. Peregoy had used the gravity model to determine projected travel to and from the site and that this is an accepted model to determine trip distribution. Mr. Maltz stated that the information was appended as A-1 and that it showed municipalities which could be considered employment generators within 40 minutes of the site. It was noted that Morristown was added to the revised data for employment destinations.

The information pertaining to use of roads was added to the Hamal Associates report as A-2. Mr. Maltz noted that 16 more trips were added to those taking Kings Highway instead of Rt. 57 to ultimately go to Schooley's Mountain Road. Mr. Bauerlein stated that he feels that the majority of the site's residents would take Kings Highway to Pleasant Grove rd. to Schooley's Mountain Rd. He also questioned Hackettstown as a major employer. Mr. Maltz stated that Hackettstown is a high scorer as an employment center because it is close to the site. Mr. Bauerlein noted that this is the nature of models; not taking into consideration numerous store fronts and an anchor store in a mall which are empty.

Mr. Mont asked if Kings Highway Invest Company had considered the Fire Department's comment regarding fire equipment access to the back of the site. Mr. Selvaggi stated that this matter will be considered as a part of the formal site plan application. Mr. DiSalvo noted that the fire equipment access would have an impact on how the buildings fit in with the setbacks for the site.

Mr. Akin asked what would happen if the bridge on Kings Highway got flooded with regard to trips. Mr. Maltz stated that the traffic would have to take Kings Highway. Mr. Trevena asked what the truck traffic would be if the industrial use was fully occupied. Mr. Peregoy stated that the traffic would be 139 vehicles in the morning and 146 in the evening and that number includes trucks.

Mr. Banisch stated that many of the municipalities in New Jersey have recently been doing redevelopment area designations which allow for a payment in lieu of taxes being reduced. He said that the arrangement can be for a thirty year period. Mr. Banisch stated that this can be done in one of two ways; though a pilot program or a five year tax abatement. He noted that certain criteria need to be met to get the process going. Mr. Buzak stated that a redevelopment plan can be used for a specific area of property so that it is not spot zoning. Mr. Bauerlein asked if the Board of Education in New Jersey have taken any legal recourse regarding the redevelopment process and the effect on taxes. Mr. Buzak said that he had not heard of any problems with Boards of Education. Mr. LiaBraaten noted that the schools would be impacted with addition student enrollment.

Attorney Buzak stated that the developer who seeks a rezoning of their property needs to go before the governing body. He said that this is not a formal process and the objective of the developer is to go to the Planning Board to get a recommendation to bring back to the governing body. Mr. Buzak stated that if the governing body does not wish to proceed with the proposal then the developer can then proceed to go before the Board of Adjustment to apply for a use variance. He stated that the role of the Planning Board is to look at this based upon the Master Plan's components, like traffic, school impact and services and make a determination if this plan is consistent with the Master Plan or if the Master Plan should be modified. He added that the Board should look at the plan to see whether this development fits in with the development scheme of the municipality.

The Board discussed having Planner Banisch draft a letter to be sent to the Township Committee which is to be circulated to the Board for comment and then sent to the Township Committee recommending the redevelopment or rezoning of this property. A straw poll was taken of the Board members. Mr. Mont stated that he is in favor of a redevelopment plan or rezoning of this property but he has concerns regarding the impact to the schools, traffic and the proposed density of the proposed project. Ms. McGroarty stated that she is in favor of a redevelopment plan for this property. Mr. DiSalvo stated that he is in favor of a redevelopment plan for this property understanding that a function of the density will be determined through the bulk standards when the plan is developed. Mr. Akin stated that he is not completely decided because he has concerns regarding neighborhood character and traffic. He advised the Township Committee to weigh-in on the financial impact and the impact on the schools of this proposal. Mr. Read said that he is in favor of a redevelopment for this property. Mr. Bauerlein said that he could be in favor with a redevelopment plan for this site but he does have concerns regarding traffic and density. Mr. LiaBraaten stated that he is abstaining from the poll because he will be considering this proposal as a Township Committee member. Mr. Trevena stated that he is in favor of a redevelopment plan although he does have concerns about the traffic.

The Board opened the meeting to the public for comments and questions. Mr. Bob Miller (President of the Diamond Hill Homeowners Association in Mansfield Township) stated that he feels that more vehicles will be using Rt. 57 for travel. He noted that getting the fire

trucks to this location might be difficult. Mr. Paul Tarlow (Rt. 57 Mansfield Township) stated that he thinks that the impact to Rt. 57 from Kings Highway needs to be considered. He stated that the Tri-County Fire Company is much closer than the Schooley's Mountain Fire Company. Mr. Trevena noted that there is mutual agreement with regard to Schooley's Mountain Fire Company and Tri-County Fire Company going to take care of a fire. The meeting was closed to public comment on this matter.

A motion was made by Mr. DiSalvo instructing the Board's professional, Mr. Banisch, to draft a letter which is then to be circulated to the Planning Board for comment and then sent a letter to the Township Committee stating that the Planning Board is recommending that the Township Committee approve a redevelopment plan for Block 30, Lots 70, 70.01 & 70.02, as was presented to the Board by Kings Highway Investment Company, LLC with the noted concerns that were made by some of the Board members bulleted in the letter. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trevena. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Ayes: Mont, Trevena, DiSalvo, McGroarty, Read, Bauerlein, Akin
Nays: None Abstentions: LiaBraaten

DISCUSSION/CORRESPONDENCE

1. Vouchers

Mr. Trevena made a motion to approve the vouchers reviewed by the Chairman and found in order and send them on for payment, seconded by Mr. DiSalvo. A voice vote was taken; all were in favor and the motion carried.

Mr. Mont made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. DiSalvo. A voice vote was taken; all were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara J. Margolese, Clerk