

The May 3, 2004 semi-monthly meeting of the Township of Chatham Planning Board was called to order at approximately 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Bill McCutcheon. The Open Public Meetings Act Statement was read into the record. The agenda for the work meeting included streetscape discussion, Oak Knoll, Van Fossen, Valle Estates, Rolling Hill at Candace, Novick/Hagner, Peapack-Gladstone and discussion of a proposed zoning ordinance.

Roll Call

Those present were Mr. McCutcheon, Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Browne, Mr. Caprioglio, Mr. Cashman, Mr. Ciccarone, Mr. Cohn, Mrs. Chambers, Mrs. Fair and Mrs. Hoag. Also present were James McCreedy, Esq., Planning Board attorney, Eileen Banyra, Planning Board planner, Marshall Frost, Planning Board engineer and Michael Bennett, Township engineer.

Streetscape Discussion

Chairman McCutcheon asked Mr. Frost to review the status of the streetscape plan. Mr. Frost stated Mr. Christenson had made a presentation to the Board a year ago regarding lighting and street trees and sidewalks. Lighting fixtures were reviewed and the most cost effective plan was to use the utility company lighting fixture. There was also a list of ideas to enhance the streetscape by Board members. Mr. Frost proposed that he would put together a packet of information to date and include a condensed version of Mr. Christenson's plan and distribute it to the Board and Ms. Banyra. Mr. Frost

suggested this be reviewed with the Township Committee; Mrs. Hoag proposed discussing the packet of information with the Planning Board first. After additional discussion it was determined Ms. Banyra and Mr. Frost would discuss the available information.

- - -

Memorializations

Van Fossen

Mrs. Hoag moved to accept the memorialization for a development permit and Mr. Cashman seconded. At roll call, all members present voted “yes”.

Oak Knoll

Mrs. Fair moved the approval of the resolution memorializing the revised final site plan and Mr. Jacobson seconded. At roll call, all members present voted “yes”.

- - -

Applications

Valle Estates

Ed Collins, Esq. and Ed Caballero of Schoor DePalma were present for the applicant to review the status of the application. Mr. Caballero stated two meetings had been held since the applicant was with the Board. The landscaping plan was reviewed and modifications were discussed that were needed to meet the ordinance. The landscape architect went into the field to review the conservation area where additional landscaping can be placed to assist in infiltration. A concept plan was submitted to Mr. Frost and Mr. Bennett.

An additional meeting was held with the contractor and the engineers to review the sequence of construction and inspection requirements. The applicant will submit documents to the engineers and the Board in advance of the May 17, 2004 meeting.

Mrs. Hoag asked about the sanitary sewer; Mr. Bennett stated the issue has been resolved. Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Caballero about the wetlands permit regarding the Indiana bat. Mr. Caballero stated a plan had been submitted to Fish and Wildlife regarding construction sequence and is waiting for a response. Mr. Caballero stated that during construction, the applicant would clear in various stages. Mr. Bennett indicated there may a conflict for clearing between April 1 and October 1 because of the Indiana bat, which may migrate to the existing pond. Mr. Frost stated the concern is that if clearing cannot be done until October, it would be difficult to stabilize the site for erosion control before winter. An outcome is awaited from Fish and Wildlife.

After discussion, the applicant respectfully requested an extension through May 18, 2004 with a hearing on May 17, 2004. Mrs. Hoag moved to grant the extension and Mr. Cashman seconded, with all in favor.

Rolling Hill at Candace

Steven Schaeffer was present on behalf of the applicant with engineer Susan Berninger and surveyor Mark Bricker. Mr. Schaeffer stated there was information on a proposal for a conservation easement. Ms. Berninger stated an operations and maintenance manual for the storm water management system was submitted, a dry well mounding analysis for roof runoff and an analysis of the pollutant loading removal of the total suspended solids relative to the "treatment train".

According to Ms. Berninger, the mounding analysis showed that the locations as proposed are adequate. The treatment train analysis showed the applicant obtained a 73% removal rate of total suspended solids without the underground sand filter; the requirement is 80%. Mr. Schaeffer indicated that the applicant would seek a diminimous exception to the requirement instead of the installation of the underground sand filter. Ms. Berninger stated in her opinion the type of water being treated would not

justify the sand filter. Mr. Bennett felt the sand filter was not necessary because of the conservation easement and agreed the exception made sense. There was discussion about the conservation easement and the impact on the water quality. Mr. Schaeffer stated that with Mr. Bennett, a line was determined 280' from the road where the conservation easement begins. Mr. Schaeffer stated that there would be a 4,000 square foot allowance, non-slope restricted, for sod or grass. The removal of dead trees would also be allowed. The total of the easements on the three lots would be 60,000 square feet, with a maximum amount of 12,000 square feet be planted in sod or grass. Mr. Browne asked if the easement restrictions were executable by a layperson; Mr. Caplan and Mr. Schaeffer reviewed the language of the conservation easement. There was additional discussion about the development and use of the area under the proposed conservation easement. In regards to storm water management, Mr. Bennett stated the purpose of the open space BMP is to leave the land in the state it is currently in to be able to re-vegetate and have the same response to rain and snow fall and it becomes deed restricted. Ms. Berninger stated that a total of 12,000 sq. ft. of woods converted to lawn, with the runoff associated with lawns, would not negatively affect the peak flow rate reductions at the property lines and would not impact the quantity of runoff.

Ms. Berninger discussed the mounding analysis, which showed that the dry wells have no impact on any down gradient structure. Ms. Berninger also addressed the operations and maintenance manual for the homeowners' association and stated it had been sent to Mr. Frost and Mr. Bennett for review. The manual was submitted as Exhibit A1 dated May 3, 2004. Mrs. Fair stated an annual report was required; Ms. Berninger stated that was in the manual. Mr. Frost asked Mr. Schaeffer if the homeowners' association declaration were submitted. Mr. Schaeffer said it had not yet been submitted.

Mark Bricker was presented. Mr. Bennett asked about the location of the dry wells and if they were at the location of the test pits; Mr. Bricker stated that the wells moved approximately 3'. Mr.

Bricker continued with the revisions to the plan, which included a high visibility fence, monumented easements and a new layout for the conservation easement, details for the sidewalks and concrete driveway aprons, driveways paved or covered with a paving block and revised grading for a positive flow of 10' before a swale. A design waiver for Lot 16 is required as a wall can no longer be placed on the property line because of a drainage manhole with a pipe. The slope is on the north side of the new manhole and affects a maximum square footage of 300' within the drainage easement. An inlet would be installed on Lot 16.04 for drainage to eliminate water crossing the sidewalk, provided the sand filter was not required.

Mr. Frost stated that the treatment train has nowhere to discharge to at this point because of legal issues; Mr. Schaeffer stated that legal issues between private property owners' do not have bearing on the Board's decision making.

Mr. Jacobson suggested the Board direct Mr. Malehorn to prepare a draft resolution with the details for discussion on May 17, 2004. Mrs. Fair expressed the need for an undisturbed conservation easement; Mr. Ciccarone concurred, as did Mrs. Chambers. Mr. Caplan stated he felt he had no choice so would go along with the undisturbed conservation easement; Mr. Frost and Board members reminded Mr. Caplan that it was his choice to build four houses instead of two.

After additional discussion, Mr. Cashman moved to grant an extension through May 18, 2004, with a hearing on May 17, 2004. Mr. McCutcheon summarized that the concern of the Board was that calculations may be skewed if property owners' made adjustments to their property. Mr. Ciccarone stated he had concerns other than the conservation easement. Mrs. Hoag stated there was a good deal of monitoring for the Township with the easement and felt maintained open space was the best answer. Chairman McCutcheon asked for public comment; there was none.

Novick/Hagner

Mr. Daines and Mr. Schommer were present on behalf of the application. Mr. Schommer presented an analysis of other locations for the proposed home and showed Exhibits A11 and A12, which were renderings of the house as submitted and the house in the alternate location, respectively. Mr. Schommer stated with A12 there were more retaining walls and the total disturbance is 61,872 sq. ft., or 24.1% of the total lot area. Mr. Schommer compared the slope disturbances of the two plans: in the 0-15% slopes, the original proposed location disturbs 1,989 sq. ft. and the alternate plan disturbs 2,400 sq. ft.; at the 15-20% slopes, the original plan disturbed 35,000 sq. ft. and the alternate disturbs 10,000 sq. ft.; at the 20-25% slopes, the original plan disturbs 15,500 sq. ft. and the alternate disturbs over 25,000 sq. ft.; the original plan disturbed 25.7% of the 20-25% slopes and the alternate disturbs 42% of the 20-25% slopes. Regarding the greater than 25% slopes, the original plan disturbs 9,400 sq. ft. or 7.6% and the alternate disturbs 12% of the 25% or greater slopes, or an area of 14,700 sq. ft. Mr. Schommer stated that this analysis shows, in his opinion, that the original location presents less disturbance to the steeper slopes. The alternate plan disturbs a total of 52,272 sq. ft. or 20.4% of the lot area while the original plan disturbs 24% of the lot area. According to Mr. Schommer, the difference in the lot area is because of the shorter driveway in the alternate plan, however, the alternate plan disturbs more of the steeper slopes categories and the house can be seen from the road. Mrs. Hoag stated there was a letter from the Fire Department notifying the Board that they could not access the originally proposed house; Mr. Schommer stated the exhibits presented showed a driveway with wider turns to accommodate emergency vehicles.

Mr. Daines asked Mr. Schommer if in his opinion, with the new regulations that apply to the storm water management requirements, could Mr. Schommer design and build a storm water management system; Mr. Schommer said it could be done for this single family home. The proposed

amount of impervious coverage is 16,663 sq. ft and the permitted amount of impervious coverage is 28,234 sq. ft. The septic field has been approved by the Board of Health and is in the 20-25% slope category. Mr. Ciccarone asked if the calculations would be significantly different without the pool or other improvements; Mr. Schommer indicated that it would not be significantly different. Mr. Jacobson commented that the presentation outlines A12 as a worse option than A11 and asked what has been done to limit slope disturbance and find a better option; Mr. Schommer indicated the safety elements of a turnaround in the driveway and that the original proposal is the best location for a single family home on the property. Mrs. Fair asked about a visual buffer from houses on Huron Drive, as it is currently a forested area; Mr. Schommer stated the Huron Drive homes' views were out and over the house, although the house could be seen.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Schommer to elaborate on BMP for storm water; Mr. Schommer stated runoff from roof area would be channeled to dry wells for recharge and overland flows and utilization of natural vegetation. Mr. Frost asked about runoff from the driveway and Mr. Schommer stated that could be picked up at various points and recharge where it can be and also use overland flow. Mr. Schommer stated a lot-grading plan would be submitted. Mr. Frost asked about the length of the driveway; Mr. Schommer responded it was approximately 775' from River Road. Mr. Bennett stated the submission of a storm water management plan was part of the requirements for a subdivision. Mr. Bennett also indicated the difficulty of the maintenance of south facing slopes. Members of the public David Dreyfus of Huron Drive and Bob Knolke (*spelling?*) of Huron Drive asked questions relative to the discussion. Ms. Banyra commented on the footprint of the house and suggested the consideration of other designs and Mr. Frost requested Exhibit A12 be submitted to the Board.

The applicant respectfully requested an extension through June 8, 2004, with a hearing on June 7. Mr. Cashman moved to grant the extension and Mrs. Hoag seconded, with all in favor.

- - -

Peapack-Gladstone Bank

Mr. Jim Lamb, Esq., was present on behalf of the applicant to discuss the redevelopment of 278 Green Village Road, which is located in the P/I-2 zone. The applicant had participated in a TCC meeting in October 2003. Three waivers are being requested including a waiver from the LOI, as there are no wetlands on the property, a waiver for aquifer recharge and a waiver from the EIS (a Phase 1 environmental assessment prepared by EcolSciences has been submitted.) Several variances are also being requested and include a variance for the undersized lot (the lot is 29,325 sq. ft. in a 45,000 sq. ft. zone) and the width of the lot, a setback variance (75' required, 48' proposed), a variance for parking (required 26, proposed is 19), a variance for impervious coverage (proposed is 60%, the zone is 40%), and a waiver for the sign ordinance as the wall mounted sign is larger than zoned.

Robert Rogers, President of Peapack-Gladstone Bank was presented, sworn in and qualified. Mr. Rogers gave a brief history of the Peapack-Gladstone Bank, showed photographs of the existing structure (Exhibits PG1-6) and stated the bank proposed to raze the current structure on the property and build a traditional 2,500' sq. ft. branch structure, one floor, to provide a full service bank with safety deposit services and drive up ATM/drive-up window banking. The bank will offer deposit services, commercial loans, trust/investment advice and home equity loans. Mr. Rogers stated that at the TCC Meeting, suggestions included moving the parking lot area to the back of the building, placing the building closer to the front of the lot with sidewalks to make it more pedestrian-friendly and installing an entrance on one side and an exit on the other side of the building, which the applicant has included. Mr. Rogers testified the hours of operation proposed at the drive-up window would be Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday from 8:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m., Thursday 8:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. and Saturday 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon; the lobby hours would be Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday

from 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., Thursday 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and Saturday 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon; the ATM would be available 24 hours a day. Mr. Rogers testified that there would be three tellers and three platform staff members and the Peapack-Gladstone Bank has a long-term lease from owners Mr. and Mrs. Goldberg. Mr. Jacobson asked about the construction time line; Mr. Lamb responded the tenants would need time to relocate and it would be more than a year until construction. Mrs. Fair asked about a walk-up ATM; Mr. Rogers stated the need did not seem to be there but would consider it if the Board requested it.

Fran Consoli of JRS Architects was presented and qualified. Ms. Consoli presented Exhibit P7, which showed a rendering of the exterior of the proposed building. Ms. Consoli testified the structure was 31' high at the highest ridge. Ms. Consoli described the exterior of the structure as traditional in style with dormers and a cupola with a weathervane and a limestone-look base and red brick front, shutters, arched windows and doors, keystone window heads, pillars and a portico at the front entrance and a 50-year rubber roof that simulates slate. The building is one floor with the dormers in the attic. Ms. Consoli also described the interior space and stated the HVAC equipment will be housed in the drive-up canopy and there would be ground level lighting proposed. Ms. Consoli stated the building as proposed is in compliance with ADA requirements and has a barrier-free entrance in the back. Ms. Consoli presented different elevations of the proposed building. Ms. Consoli testified that the length of the name of the bank necessitated requesting a variance from the sign ordinance. The hearing will continue May 17, 2004.

Vince Falone, resident of the Township and professional tenant in the existing building asked questions relative to the discussion.

- - -

Zoning Ordinance

Mrs. Fair notified the Board that in April the Township Committee introduced an ordinance to change the zoning in the Green Village area pertaining to two parcels currently zoned R-2 to be re-zoned to R-3 zones. The public hearing will be held at the end of May. The Board members will discuss this subject at the May 17, 2004 meeting and make a formal recommendation to the Township Committee.

Public Comment

Resident Dot Stillinger asked questions regarding the septic/sewer for the Hagner/Novick application.

There being no further business, the Planning Board Meeting of May 3, 2004 was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine T. Hollerith
Recording Secretary