

A meeting of the Township of Hamilton Planning Board was held on the above date with Chairman David Wigglesworth presiding. Other members present were Harry Bilicki, Charles Cain, Richard Cheek, Wayne Choyce, William Christman, John Kurtz and John Percy. Alternate member present was Harry Rogers. Also present were Kevin Dixon, Alternate Engineer Consultant; Alexander Litwornia, Traffic Engineer Consultant; Vincent Polistina, Planner Consultant; and John Rosenberger, Solicitor.

Compliance with the Open Public Meetings Law was acknowledged.

Approval of Minutes – Mr. Christman moved, seconded by Mr. Cain, to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 4, 2011, as published. SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL MEMBERS VOTING “AYE”, NO “NAY”, NO “ABSTAIN”.

Parish of St. Vincent de Paul (Request to amend approval) – Francis Monari, Attorney, and Clifton Quay, P.E., P.P., were present.

Mr. Monari informed those present that the Applicant was proposing to amend the approval granted to permit construction of a church, to provide for the cemetery’s maintenance building, that was designated for demolition, to remain in place, temporarily, until approval could be secured for the new maintenance building in a different location. He requested that the Board grant a time period not to exceed two years.

Pointing to a plan of the site, Mr. Quay indicated the location of the building, and explained that it had been anticipated that the cemetery project would precede the church project, but the opposite took place.

Mr. Quay stated that the environmental studies required by the Pinelands Commission had already been done for the entire site, and he was almost finished with the plan for the cemetery expansion.

Mr. Quay described the proposal to temporarily relocate the driveway that was to be constructed where the maintenance building was presently located. He stated that it would be fully paved in compliance with the approved standard, with the paving to be completely removed upon the demolition of the building and relocation of the drive, and reconstructed in its originally approved location.

Mr. Quay testified that they would use a stone drive to access the two garage doors on the side; that the bathroom facility would be abandoned completely; that a small office would remain; that electricity to the building would remain to provide light and heat; and that the building would be used for storage of equipment necessary for the general work and maintenance of the cemetery.

Mr. Quay stated that there was an existing pole mounted light on the corner of the building that is in the same general vicinity as where the approved light pole is to be located, and he expressed the opinion that it would provide adequate lighting as a temporary substitute. He stated that the light was a standard cobra head and it was his opinion that it would not create an impact on Dennis Foreman Drive because of where it was located.

Mr. Quay testified that there would be some temporary grading around the building to make sure that runoff gets directed as intended. He stated there would be approximately 4,200 square feet of impervious coverage that was not intended to be there, but the engineer that designed the site had informed him that a 10,000 recreation building, which was not being built, had been included in the drainage calculations for the site, and it was his opinion that would more than offset the temporary condition.

In response to questions and concerns with regard to paving the temporary drive to Ordinance standard and then removing it, Mr. Quay stated that they preferred that it be paved to make it easier for snow removal; to provide a suitable surface for emergency vehicles; to provide a suitable surface for access to the rectory; and to have the site look completed, even though it would be completely removed upon demolition of the building and construction of the new drive.

In response to additional questions, Mr. Quay advised that the drive would be twenty-five feet in width and approximately two hundred feet in length; that a portion of it would be used by cemetery maintenance personnel; that the drive would not be used as egress for church services; that the drive was not intended for general circulation; that the drive was intended to provide emergency circulation around the site; and that the drive would probably be used upon construction of the rectory.

Mr. Wigglesworth questioned the relationship between the church and the cemetery and how it affected the application.

Mr. Monari stated that the Parish of St. Vincent de Paul owned the entire tract; that the Applicant is the Parish of St. Vincent de Paul; and that Holy Cross Cemetery was sponsored by the Parish of St. Vincent de Paul, but it was administered by the Diocese of Camden. He advised that the Diocese owns very few cemeteries, but it does administer some cemeteries, which relieves parishes of the responsibility.

Mr. Quay advised that the Parish Priest, Fr. Heintzleman, had seen the plan for the temporary modification and was aware of it.

Mr. Percy asked questions related to the original approval and responses were provided.

Mr. Percy questioned why sidewalk had not been provided from the existing sidewalk on Route 40 to some point on site to accommodate safe, pedestrian movement due to the residential development in the area, existing and proposed. Mr. Monari stated that he could not answer Mr. Percy's question, but he would discuss the issue with Fr. Heintzleman, and they would be prepared to address it when the application for approval of the cemetery maintenance building is presented to the Board.

Mr. Polistina recommended that the application be deemed complete for review and stated that he had no comments from a planning perspective.

Mr. Dixon referred to his report and recommended that the application be deemed complete. He stated that the Applicant had satisfactorily addressed his comments with regard to additional impermeable coverage; that he was satisfied that the proposed temporary grading would provide a similar flow path for the runoff; and that he was satisfied that temporarily retaining the existing pole mounted light at the corner of the building was an acceptable solution to providing illumination of the drive. Mr. Dixon asked if the proposed paving section would be consistent with that of the original plan, and Mr. Quay replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Litwornia expressed concern with regard to the alignment of the temporary drive, and he recommended that it be modified to remove the reverse curve in the interest of public safety. Mr. Quay explained why it was designed as presented, but he agreed to revise the alignment as recommended by Mr. Litwornia.

Mr. Litwornia suggested constructing the drive and leaving it in place after demolition of the new building. Mr. Quay replied that the temporary road encroached upon the lawn area for the rectory; that thirty feet of space would be cleared when it was moved to its approved location; and that the road design that had been developed for the new maintenance building aligns with the driveway per the original plan.

Mr. Percy moved, seconded by Mr. Cain, to grant temporary amended site plan approval to the Parish of St. Vincent de Paul, Block 966, Lots 31 and 32, Application No. 2010-008, to permit the postponement of the demolition of the existing cemetery maintenance building for a period not to exceed two years, and to permit temporary realignment of the proposed drive that

was to have been constructed upon demolition of the building, conditioned upon modifying the proposed temporary drive to the satisfaction of the Board's Traffic Engineer Consultant, and compliance with the recommendations contained within the reports of Kevin Dixon, dated August 15, 2011; Vincent Polistina, dated August 11, 2011, and Alexander Litwornia, dated August 9, 2011.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE ABOVE MOTION:

Mr. Bilicki – Aye  
Mr. Cain – Aye  
Mr. Cheek – Aye  
Mr. Choyce – Aye

Mr. Christman - Aye  
Mr. Kurtz - Aye  
Mr. Percy - Aye  
Mr. Rogers – Aye  
Mr. Wigglesworth – Aye

SAID MOTION CARRIED.

Pinelands CMP Clustering Provision – Mr. Polistina referred to the draft report he had submitted to the Board last month, and reminded Board members that the Pinelands Commission had extended the Township's time for compliance until the end of the year. He summarized the changes the Township would need to make to comply, and stated that the only item that may be found to be objectionable would be the provision for a bonus density.

In response to questions of Board members, Mr. Polistina explained that, presently, there is a conflict between the Pinelands CMP and the Township's Ordinance provisions, and developers submitting applications within the Forest Area or Rural Development Area would need to seek lot area variances.

Board asked questions and offered comments to which Mr. Polistina responded.

Mr. Polistina advised that the Township could have further discussion with the Pinelands Commission Staff with regard to the density bonus, as they may be willing to reduce it, and he asked for direction.

Mr. Cain stated that he felt Mr. Polistina should discuss it with the Pinelands' Staff in an attempt to eliminate the density bonus or reduce it, if there is no opportunity to fully eliminate it. Mr. Wigglesworth asked if all Board members were in favor of Mr. Polistina meeting with the Pinelands Staff to discuss the issue, and no objection was presented.

Mr. Polistina stated he would present the argument that developers would already be getting a bonus because they would be able to develop one acre lots, which would result in a savings with regard to infrastructure and related costs. Mr. Polistina, also, stated he would let the Pinelands Staff know that the Township was in agreement with everything except the density bonus, and that it would go forward and adopt the remainder of the provisions if the bonus were eliminated.

Mr. Polistina stated that, if Pinelands is in agreement, the Board could go forward with its Master Plan Re-examination Report hearing, after which the Township could amend the Land Use Ordinance to comply.

Public Comment – Mr. Wigglesworth opened the meeting to public comment and there was no response.

Mr. Cain moved, seconded by Mr. Choyce, to close the public portion of the meeting. SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL MEMBES VOTING "AYE", NO "NAY", NO "ABSTAIN".

Village Commercial Parking Standards – Mr. Cain reported that Township Committee unanimously passed the introduction of the Ordinance which contained revisions to the Village Commercial standards, with the amendments the Board recommended. He noted that the Township Administrator was looking into a way to fair share the money that would be collected for the parking spaces.

Adjournment – Mr. Percy moved, seconded by Mr. Cheek, to adjourn the meeting. SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL MEMBERS VOTING “AYE”, NO “NAY”, NO “NAY”, NO “ABSTAIN”.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Rainbow,  
Planning Board Administrator