

**HILLSBOROUGH TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD**

**PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

**June 25, 2015**

Chairman Steven Sireci, Jr. called the Planning Board Public Meeting of June 04, 2015 to order at 7:31 p.m. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The meeting took place in the Courtroom of the Municipal Complex.

Chairman Sireci announced the meeting had been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 ("Sunshine Law").

**ROLL CALL**

Deputy Mayor Greg Burchette - Absent	Sam Conard - Absent
Michael Merdinger - Absent	<b>Dr. Steven Sireci, Jr., Chairman</b> - Present
Committeeman Frank DelCore - Absent	Robert Wagner, Jr. - Present
<b>Steve Cohen, Vice Chairman</b> - Absent	Robert Peason (Alt. #1) - Present
<b>Dr. Daniel Marulli, Secretary</b> - Present	Shawn Lipani (Alt. #2) - Absent
Neil Julian - Present	

Also present: David Kois, PP, Deputy Planning Director / Zoning Official; Eric M. Bernstein, Esq., Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein, & Associates); Brian Boccanfuso, PE, CME, Alternate Engineer (CME Associates); Lucille Grozinski, CCR, Board Court Reporter; and Caz Bielen, Board Videographer (Premier Media, LLC).

**DISPOSITION OF MINUTES**

None

**DISPOSITION OF RESOLUTIONS**

- RETS Partners, LLC, File 15-PB-06-SRV

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Peason, seconded by Dr. Marulli.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Wagner - yes; Dr. Marulli - yes; Mr. Julian - yes; Mr. Peason - yes; Chairman Sireci - yes. Motion carried.

**PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS**

None

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS**

None

**BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

None

**CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES**

None

**CORRESPONDENCE**

- NJDEP Permit Application - Duke Farms
- SCPB letter of 06-23-15 - Declaratory Judgement Resource

Chairman Sireci noted the correspondence provided for the Board's review.

**PUBLIC HEARING - SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN APPLICATIONS** (Scheduled with permission by the Board)

- AMWELL COMMONS (RPM Development, LLC)** - File 15-PB-09-MSRV/SR - Block 163.05, Lots 101, 102, 103, 104, & 105 (formerly known as Block 163, Lots 12, 11, 10, 9 & 8) - Lot 101 - 495 Amwell Road; Lot 102 - Q Farm - Amwell Road; Lot 103 - 503 Amwell Road; Lot 104 - 505 Amwell Road; Lot 105 - 507 Amwell Road. Applicant seeking Minor Subdivision with 'c' Bulk Variance for relief from lot frontage onto a public street, and Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval, to reconfigure lot lines by merging five lots into one and subdivide the (+/-) 20.9 acres into two lots; the front lot (Proposed Lot 101.01) at 3.7434 acres, the rear lot (Proposed Lot 101.02) at 17.1659 acres. Applicant seeking to demolish all but one existing structures and construct two two-story multi-unit apartment buildings on Proposed Lot 101.01, to contain 54 affordable housing rental units, with a 14 unit set-aside for individuals with special needs, associated community area,

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

parking and improvements, on property in the ARW, Amwell Road West Zoning District. Property included in the New Amwell Redevelopment Plan. (*EC Review: 06-22-15*).

**Exhibits:**

- A-1** - RPM Hillsborough - Proposed Site Plan (Colorized Display)
- A-2** - RPM Hillsborough - Material Board (Colorized Display)
- A-3** - Kitchen Photo (Colorized Photo Display)
- A-4** - RPM Hillsborough - Rendering (Colorized Display)
- A-5** - Hillsborough Affordable Housing Apartments - Minor Subdivision Plan
- A-6** - Hillsborough Affordable Housing Apartments - Site Plan

**Michael O'Grodnick, Esq.**, of Mauro, Savo, Camerino, Grant & Schalk, representing the Applicant, RPM Development, LLC, stated the witnesses present to testify as: Brendan McBride, Vice President of RPM Development, Jack Inglese, Architect; Mike Ford, PE, Engineer; Peter VanDerKoy, PP, Planner; and Betsy Dolan, PE, Traffic Engineer.

Mr. O'Grodnick stated the following:

Notice pursuant to the MLUL with certified mailings to property owners as well as publication in the Hillsborough Beacon and affidavits to that effect, had been submitted to the Planning Office.

The application is for a COAH project seeking to construct 54 units of affordable housing rental apartments, in compliance with the Hillsborough Township Housing and Fair Share Plan, originally adopted on August 5, 2010. The subject area was later designated as an area in need of Redevelopment and adopted as such by Ordinance on May 12, 2015.

The total property is currently a cluster of lots totaling about 29 acres; 751 ft. of frontage on Amwell Road; within the Amwell Road West (ARW) District. Currently there are 4 older residential dwellings slated to be demolished in conjunction with the application. Properties to the north contain residential; properties to the west are home-occupation properties which contain residences and an office complex and associated parking area to the East; the rear of the 20-acre property is the Roycebrook which impacts wetlands and transition areas. No environmentally sensitive areas will be impacted for this application.

The requests for this application are for preliminary and final minor subdivision approval to consolidate all of the irregularly shaped lots and then subdivide them into 2 lots; the front lot, which is the subject of this application, will have frontage on Amwell Road and consist of 3.74 acres. The second proposed lot to the rear will contain 17 acres, but not proposed to be improved at this time and not part of this application.

A variance is requested for access by way of an easement which will travel through the main driveway of this development, upon approval.

The application is for 2 apartment buildings containing 54 dwelling units; the proposed building on the westerly portion will contain 26 units as well as a community room and management office; the easterly portion building is proposed to contain 28 apartment units.

The buildings contain a mix of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom apartments; 14 units will be allocated for special needs and alternate living arrangement housing; the site will be serviced by 100 parking spaces; access will be provided via a paved driveway for ingress and egress from the northerly side of Amwell Road, which will coincide with the easement dedicated to the lot to the north.

Stormwater management will include porous pavement. Underground detention basin manufactured water quality treatment structure. The proposed buildings will be serviced by the existing utility mains. Concrete walkways are proposed throughout the site to provide access to the parking area and apartments. Landscaping and lighting improvements will be consistent with the Township ordinance and design standards. One 'c' bulk variance, as discussed, is required for minimum lot frontage for the back lot.

**Brendon McBride**, Vice President of RPM Development, LLC, was sworn in and gave the following testimony:

RPM Development, LLC has been in business since 1986, primarily rental developers working only in New Jersey. The company has developed, manages and leases approximately 3,000 units state wide.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

RPM Development, LLC handles all aspects, including development, funding, construction, leasing and management. RPM typically is managing buildings for 30 to 45 years. RPM primarily builds housing that is affordable for low and moderate income.

Somerset County, and Hillsborough in particular, is a desirable area. Market rents for this area on average are \$1,200 for a 1-bedroom, \$1,400 for a 2-bedroom, and \$1,900 for a 3-bedroom. One would need to make \$75,000 to be able to afford a 3-bedroom rental. RPM focuses on providing housing to those that fall below this income level. This proposal is for those making less than 60% of the median income, which for a family of 3, would be an average yearly household income of \$56,000. This type of housing is available to a variety of people, most of whom are working class. Fully 17% of the population of Hillsborough, which is currently over 2,000 households, would qualify to live in this housing

The rents being proposed are: \$800 - \$975 for a 1-bedroom unit; \$900 - \$1,150 for the 2-bedroom unit; and \$1,050 - \$1,325 for the 3-bedroom unit.

There is a set-aside of 14 units for special needs tenants. These units will all be 2-bedroom units for people with developmental or mental disabilities. Social Services would be associated, depending on the condition of the tenant. The State has put an emphasis on these types of units in Somerset County due to a particularly high demand here. The State will be helping out with some of the housing subsidy for those tenants. RPM Development has a huge demand for housing, operating 5 developments in nearby Franklin Township, each of which has a waiting list of around 1,000 people. The vacancy rate is about 2 ½% as compared to the vacancy rentals in Hillsborough, which is around 7 1/2%.

RPM Development units are attractive, high quality places to live, built to last. Mr. McBride showed examples of existing developments and stated the company puts in hardwood flooring in the living spaces; high quality heating and cooling facilities to make the utilities lower; and build sustainable buildings, having more LEED Gold and Platinum projects for energy efficient buildings than any other builder in the State.

RPM has very stringent requirements, typically going through ten applications to get one tenant that qualifies. RPM does criminal background and credit checks, and landlord verification. There will be a live-in superintendent available 24 hours to care for the two buildings.

Open to the Public

**Bill Tretheway** - Millstone River Road

- Mr. Tretheway asked what the percentage is for other RPM developments regarding the number of housing going to the existing residents of that town vs. other areas.

Mr. McBride said in Franklin Township, 40% of the tenants were residents of the township.

**Diane Morrison** - Gabriel Court

- Ms. Morrison requested consideration be given to increase the number of units available for the disabled. She said right now, there is a four year waiting list in surrounding counties.

Mr. McBride said there are 14 units set aside for special needs, but that would not restrict RPM from accepting additional tenants with special needs if there is a demand.

**Robin Yeager** - Bluebird Drive

- Ms. Yeager had questions on traffic and engineering matters, to be addressed with other witnesses.

**John "Jack" C. Inglese, RA, PE**, was sworn in, provided his qualifications, was accepted by the Board and gave the following testimony:

Mr. Inglese reviewed Exhibits A-1 through A-4.

Mr. Inglese said there will be a single entry point for two individual buildings, each with its own parking lot and trash enclosure. The entrances into the buildings are from the parking lot side. Each is a 2-story building, slab on grade, wood construction with two different tones of brick and two different colors and

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

textures of siding. Each building has 4 separate entrances. There are 8 units in each building, 4 on the first floor, 4 on the second, set up "garden apartment" style. Each building has a first floor common laundry room. The air conditioning units will be mounted on the flat portion of the roof where they are not visible.

The units will most likely be better than most market rate housing in terms of finishes and energy efficiency. All buildings have to be energy star buildings, not just built to Code. Each unit has a high efficiency gas furnace located in the unit with intake and exhaust piping so that there are no combustion fumes within the unit; forced hot air heat; central air conditioning; and an individual gas hot water heater in the unit. Utilities are separate. LEED goes beyond energy star products. This project will reach gold standards.

Mr. Inglese explained the typical kitchen set-up as shown in Exhibit A-3. He said one of the buildings has two 3-bedroom units replaced by a 2,027 sf. community room, alongside a management office. There is a mix of eight 1-bedroom units at 802 sf., thirty-two 2-bedroom units at 934 sf., and fourteen 3-bedroom units at 1,207 sf., which is above state requirements, closer to market-rate units.

There are no elevators in the buildings so by Code; all ground floor units must be adaptable for wheelchair access. The special needs units will be set up for wheelchair access from the beginning. It is the landlord's responsibility to accommodate any tenant with handicap accessibility. The upper units are designed in the same way as first floor units for efficiency of the plan.

Mr. Kois asked about feature of the exterior design of the buildings.

Mr. Inglese reviewed building details shown on Exhibit A-4. He stated each building is roughly 64' x 90'. Mr. Boccanfuso asked more details on the community room.

Mr. Inglese said the community room is solely for the tenants in the buildings, not their guests. Typically, this type of room is used for community meetings and events. Classes, such as yoga and computer classes are typically offered. Planned activities are generally tailored to the tenant population by the management staff.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked if there are any other architectural features in the set-aside units, not already described.

Mr. Inglese said the only difference is that these units have fully finished accessibility features.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked if the air conditioning units will be screened from visibility and sound.

Mr. Inglese said the units will not be visible and will be sound proofed in the sense that they will be enclosed within a parapet peaked roof.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked about signage.

Mr. Inglese said signage was not detailed into this packet. There may be a request at some point to do a low ground mount sign to identify the buildings. Any signage will comply with the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Bernstein asked for clarification on how the number of units was determined.

Mr. McBride replied the number is based on funding. Funding through the State Housing and Mortgage Agency which requires no more than 20% of the buildings be 1-bedroom, and no less than 25% be 3-bedrooms. The proposed structure yields 1-bedroom units at 8%.

Mr. Inglese reviewed the sprinkler system and fire detection system, as well as the location of the hard wired fire alarms and carbon monoxide alarms.

**Bill Tretheway**

□ Mr. Tretheway asked how garbage and recycling would be handled.

Mr. Inglese pointed out the enclosed trash and recycling areas on the site plan display. The area would be accessible for wheelchairs.

**Mike O'Donnell - Amwell Road**

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

□ Mr. O'Donnell asked if RPM Development worked in urban and suburban areas.

Mr. McBride said 40% of development is within suburbs.

□ Mr. O'Donnell said the plan looks like it is more fitting for urban areas, not suburban.

**Michael K. Ford, PE, PP**, Van Cleef Engineering, was sworn in, was accepted by the Board and gave the following testimony:

The subdivision element consolidates the existing lots and then creates two lots. The 3.78 acre parcel is the subject of the application. The remaining 17 acre parcel to the rear of the property contains all of the environmentally sensitive areas that have been mapped, such as flood plains, will not be affected by this application. The 17 acre parcel would be the subject of a subsequent application by another applicant, the subject of which is unknown at this time.

The County has jurisdiction over the construction of the driveway since Amwell Road is a County road. The existing structures will be removed. Applications have been made for public sewer and public water. Drainage runoff will continue to drain to Amwell Road. An underground detention basin is proposed underneath the parking areas rather than an above-ground basin. The green areas for this site are limited and are in front of the building.

The buildings are placed within the required setbacks. The buildings comply with the ordinance in all facets. The setback for the front of the buildings is 20 ft.; the proposed has them set back at approximately 50 ft. from the right-of-way line on the roadway. The side yard setback requirement is 20 ft.; the closest building for the proposed is 38 ft. The rear yard setback requirement is 20 ft. as well; the proposed is at 94 ft.

The parking will be behind the building to allow for the front to be landscaped. A portion of the parking area will be surfaced with pervious pavement. This type of pavement provides for infiltration of stormwater through the pavement and into the underground management system, providing for water quality measures as well. The underground stormwater collects the stormwater and releases it at a controlled rate. There is a connection for that basin to the existing stormwater facilities in Amwell Road.

The Applicant will address each and every comment of the SCPB letter as a condition of approval. RPM will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the stormwater management system. An owner's manual will be prepared spelling out the operation and maintenance of the stormwater management facilities.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked if the stormwater runoff water would be treated.

Mr. Ford said the Applicant will address each and every comment listed in the engineering report from CME Associates, dated June 25, 2015, and the June 22, 2015 planning report from Mr. Kois, as a condition of approval.

Generators are not included in the plan, nor are they proposed. A site sign will be provided at the entrance, identifying the property, as per ordinance. A street sign can be provided as well. The Applicant may need to consider another development name being that there already is an "Amwell Commons" on Amwell Road behind ShopRite.

The Applicant does not anticipate having a rental trailer on-site. Rentals would be handled through the management office once the buildings are up. There may be a temporary construction trailer on-site as the buildings are being built, as is typical with any construction site.

Mr. Boccanfuso noted that aside from a few technical comments, his review finds the proposed stormwater management complies with all applicable standards. There are also factors of safety built into the design that the Applicant's engineer has not taken credit for.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked if the development would be phased or built at one time, with CO's sought for both buildings at the same time.

Mr. Ford stated phasing is not envisioned.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked how the final subdivision would be provided.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

Mr. Ford replied it will be done by Deed.

Mr. Ford noted the application was reviewed by the Environmental Commission earlier in the week. Because this application does not impact any environmental areas, NJ DEP Permits are not required. A Phase I Environmental Assessment has not been done yet. The Applicant is under contract for the purchase of the property. The Phase I will be a requirement of financing. Any potential existing conditions related to the land or existing homes, would have to be cleaned up and addressed prior to any CO's being issued. A copy of the report will be provided to the Township once published. A copy of the Freshwater Wetland LOI will also be provided.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked if the Environmental Commission had a recommendation for a conservation easement.

Mr. Ford said he did not believe so. The application is for the front portion of the property so the Applicant would have no jurisdiction or control on imposing a conservation easement on the rear property and the area in which it might be placed. He suggested making such recommendation at the time an application is made for the development of the rear property.

Chairman Sireci said the Board always takes up that issue when environmentally sensitive areas are involved.

Mr. Boccanfuso stated that since a subdivision is part of this application, the Board would be able to impose it at this time, if so inclined.

Chairman Sireci said it would be better to address any conservation easement at the time of site plan.

Mr. Julian spoke of the review by the Environmental Commission (EC) earlier in the week. He stated Mr. Ford already touched on several points. The EC found no significant impacts in the May, 2015 Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Dynamic Engineering. A full Phase I Assessment will review any potential contamination on the site, not that there is any. Mr. Julian said the EC was in concurrence with Mr. Kois' report, further touching on items 16-19, pertaining to lighting, shade trees, the landscaping plan and maintenance, and buffering.

Dr. Marulli asked Mr. Ford to give more details about the "future road" and access.

Mr. Ford said conceptual access was addressed by others in the Redevelopment Plan. The Applicant is proposing single access to Amwell Road. The access on the final plan for the 17 acres is not known, but they would gain access through the driveway proposed with this application, and also have means to an alternate access via an easement that was created when the driveway to the west of this site was approved for the medical office. This would provide flexibility for emergency access at the time of development of the rear property. For this application, the driveway would be constructed to the property line of the front parcel. The westerly proposed potential access shown on the plan is not a certainty.

Mr. Peason asked for further review of the number of parking spaces proposed, being that this site is off of a main road with no tertiary roadway for parking.

Mr. Ford stated parking along Amwell Road is prohibited. One-hundred parking spaces are proposed at this site, vs. the minimum requirement of 87 per ordinance. The Applicant does not envision the 87 spaces being necessary, based on the operation of its other facilities.

Mr. Peason asked if the number of spaces takes into account a suburban setting where people are going to be using their cars vs. an urban setting.

Mr. McBride answered by saying they have had traffic studies done in Franklin Township where there are identical unit mixes with less access to public transit. The 1 and 2-bedroom units typically tend to be 1-car households. There is a restriction of 2 people for a 1-bedroom apartment. Other areas in Franklin Township show 1.2 and 1.6 spaces needed for these units, which is less than proposed here. It is less likely that those with special needs will have vehicles, although visitors or social services providers will be there at times. There will be vans providing transportation to some, but those vans will not typically stay parked in the development.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

- Mr. Molnar said there is a practicality of how many parking spaces there are for tenants. You can have 2 cars for a 1-bedroom unit, possibly 3 spaces for a 2-bedroom, depending on the age of the child. He said 100 spaces was nowhere near the number of spaces necessary for a development of this size.

**Margaret Warden** - Bluebird Drive

- Ms. Warden said she agreed with the previous speaker on parking. She asked the Board to consider the Roycebrook issues now due to flooding in the basements of abutting Meadows units. This application seems to be well thought out in terms of drainage but it looks as though it will be a problem in the future with the development of the rear property. Whatever is developed upstream tends to create more runoff downstream.

**Abhy Majumder** - Somerset Park

- Mr. Majumder asked if there will be future access through Merritt Drive.

Mr. Ford said that would be the subject of another application. There is no access other than Amwell Road proposed for this application.

Chairman Sireci commented that this Applicant is not responsible for whatever might be built behind their property. That would be the subject of another application with its own set of plans and reports.

Mr. Kois said his understanding is that the Applicant does not own any lands directly adjacent to Merritt Drive. There are at least two other properties in between, so there would be no way to get to Merritt Drive.

**Bill Tretheway** - Millstone River Road

- Mr. Tretheway asked what is generally proposed for development for the back property as part of the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Ford said the back property is in the same zone as this property and part of the same Redevelopment Plan. Any proposed development as part of the Plan is only conceptual.

- Mr. Tretheway asked how the Applicant can know if the driveway proposed is adequate to service the rear property development if they have no knowledge of what will be developed.

□

Mr. Ford again reviewed the means of access for the site.

- Mr. Tretheway questioned how a traffic study could be done if you do not know what type of development is proposed for the rear property.

Chairman Sireci said it is irrelevant to this application but will be relevant to the application for development of the rear property. If the access is insufficient for a future plan, then that future plan is in trouble, not this application.

Mr. Ford added, since the future application has to comply in every way, this application would be a limiting factor to the next application.

Chairman Sireci instructed Mr. Tretheway to hold his traffic comments for the traffic consultant.

**Andy Santabarbara** - Claremont Drive

- Mr. Santabarbara asked who owns the property behind the subject property.

Mr. Ford said it would be retained by the owner of the overall 20 acres.

- Mr. Santabarbara asked if RPM owns the property and if so, if they plan to develop the rear property.

Mr. Ford said RPM does not own the property and has no plans to develop the back portion.

- Mr. Santabarbara asked about emergency generators, keeping in mind the special needs units.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

Mr. Ford said the matter was discussed but the Applicant does not feel it is necessary to have emergency generators.

**Mike O'Donnell** - Amwell Road

□ Mr. O'Donnell asked about the stormwater runoff.

Mr. Ford said the runoff is not dumped onto Amwell Road. The stormwater is connected to an existing storm drainage system underground on Amwell Road. The stormwater report was provided as part of this application and reviewed by the Board's engineer.

Chairman Sireci stated by law, an Applicant has to account for the stormwater for a development. The stormwater drainage cannot be adversely impacted by their development.

Mr. Ford said detailed calculations were done in conformance with Township, County, DRCC, and SUSCD standards. The Applicant is required to secure those approvals to their satisfaction as well.

□ Mr. O'Donnell asked if the already high water table was considered.

Mr. Ford confirmed it was.

Mr. Boccanfuso stated there are features in the design of the stormwater that allow a significant portion of the runoff from the site to infiltrate back into the ground, in form of perforated pipes and underground stone beds. Not all of the water from this site will make its way to Amwell Road.

Mr. Ford pointed out there is a fairly large dam located immediately to the left of the High School athletic fields, which is a regional stormwater management system, constructed many years ago to account for runoff from development. The thought being that rather than have each site have its own specific stormwater management system, the regional basin would be developed to control runoff. This site sits within that drainage area so theoretically, this property could be developed with just water quality measures, having all of the water quantity runoff being managed by the regional stormwater management system. The Applicant has taken no credit for that existing system in its calculations. Both the treatment of the water quality and the handling of the water quantity have been handled on-site. The rear portion of this property drains through another regional detention basin near the old house on Amwell Road.

□ Mr. O'Donnell continued to express his concerns for potential flooding, given his close proximity to the site.

Mr. Ford state basements are not proposed.

□ Mr. O'Donnell asked about emergency generators.

Mr. McBride said there would be an emergency management plan in place if the electricity went out for a duration. An emergency generator is not required by law. Budgets for these types of projects are limited so it is not included in the plan.

□ Mr. O'Donnell asked if Emergency Management would need to come in and remove the special needs tenants.

Mr. McBride said he would not be the one preparing the plan so he could not speak to the specifics of the plan. He stated there is an emergency management plan for every building for any number of emergency situations.

BREAK

**Elizabeth Dolan, PE**, Traffic Engineer, from Dolan and Dean Consulting was sworn in, reviewed her credentials, was accepted by the Board and gave the following testimony:

Ms. Dolan reviewed the Traffic Impact Assessment dated May 6, 2015. She said traffic counts were done on Amwell Road and Pleasant View Road intersection, performed April 30<sup>th</sup> from 7-9 a.m. and 4-6:30 p.m. The morning peak hour was identified as 7-8 a.m.; the evening peak was identified as 4:45 - 5:45 p.m.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

Ms. Dolan reviewed the process of how traffic calculations are determined to establish the inbound and outbound flows of traffic during the morning and evening hours. She said the Study shows 28 movements into and out of the site during the peak morning hour, 34 during the evening peak hour. Studies show that not everyone leaves or returns at the same time, the movement is gradual.

The driveway has been designed as a residential roadway with a 50 ft. right-of-way and a 24 ft. cartway to accommodate a 2-way flow. This street will account for all movements in and out of this development. No special accounting has been given to the special needs units. The levels of service analysis for the driveway are determined to be "A" through "D" for the proposed unsignalized driveway, as proposed. The levels of service are comparable to those at Pleasant View Road, which are acceptable.

The County has no issue with the level of service or the calculation projections. The County asked for an increased radius to move vehicles into and out of the property more easily.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked whether or not the parking lot meets RSIS requirements.

Ms. Dolan said RSIS requires 104 spaces for 52 units. The RSIS states that other parking ratios shall apply. The traffic analysis for the proposal of 100 spaces is pretty much spot on for conventional apartment dwelling.

Mr. Bernstein pointed out the proposal is for 54 units.

Ms. Dolan corrected her testimony by saying 108 spaces would be required for 54 units.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked how bus drop-off and pick-up will be effectuated at the site for school-aged children and for the special needs tenants.

Ms. Dolan said the school bus pick-up would be comparable to the bus pick-up and drop-off that occurs on Amwell Road. This site would have one intersection where this would occur for all 54 units, perhaps by way of an enhanced sidewalk area. The details of which would need to be worked out with the school board to accommodate this specific bus stop. The pick-up and drop-off for the special needs would be done by way of vans, which can be accommodated by conventional or handicap parking spaces.

Mr. Boccanfuso said he has no objection to a widened sidewalk, should that be the preference of the Board.

Mr. Boccanfuso asked how the driveway will end within the property.

Ms. Dolan said the matter was discussed with the Applicant. Although one can readily see there is nowhere to go, the Applicant is willing to install a chain or perhaps the break-away barrier with orange and white stripping or other visual aids. The temporary installation of a dead end or barricade may be appropriate. No parking would be allowed on the driveway.

Mr. Wagner expressed his concern with the traffic on Amwell Road, especially when making left-hand turns. Mr. Wagner asked for further review of the traffic counts.

Ms. Dolan said from 7-9 a.m., there were 911 eastbound turns during the peak hour, compared with 464 heading west. One of the features designed into this plan is a long throat length, which can comfortably accommodate several vehicles. The new access is well spaced between the existing driveway to the east and Pleasant View to the west. The sight triangles will need to be maintained. The design is solid and follows the standards of residential improvement standards as well as standards of the County. The projection is for 18 left-hand turns in a 1-hour period.

Mr. Wagner asked at what speed one would have to go down to, to be able to turn into the driveway.

Ms. Dolan said stopping sight distance is about 450 ft. in for this site.

Mr. Wagner said he did not know that much could be done but that the 4-lanes of traffic is a concern.

Ms. Dolan said the design is appropriate for the site.

**Bill Tretheway**

- Mr. Tretheway asked how the levels of function would be affected once the back property is developed.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

Ms. Dolan said she had not performed those calculations nor has she counted the driveway to the east. There would need to be additional traffic counts plus the projections talked about. The expectation is that the levels of service would decrease exiting the property. The level of the left-hand turns in would probably not change. The levels are at "C" in the morning and "D" in the evening, but could possibly decrease on the outbound movement.

Chairman Sireci said when a development in the back is proposed, hypothetical numbers will not be used; all required studies will need to be done. That traffic report will include this development and the counts observed from it. The more relevant question is whether or not this driveway is engineered to support more of a residential neighborhood beyond it.

Ms. Dolan said it is certainly developed to the appropriate RSIS standards, and is within a cartway and right-of-way that will meet the dimensions of a continuation of a residential neighborhood. Any traffic study associated with its development will include the medical office and its driveway, and the residences proposed in this front residential area.

□ Mr. Tretheway asked if the traffic from the medical office will impact the proposed driveway.

Ms. Dolan replied that any traffic that enters and exits the medical office driveway was included in the volume count collected for Amwell Road. The specific movements into and out of that driveway were not studied. The spacing of this driveway to the medical office driveway is appropriately spaced.

□ Mr. Tretheway continued with questions about the proposed access into the site.

Mr. McBride said his understanding of the approved zoning does not allow for more than 75 dwelling units for the back property. He told Mr. Tretheway that his hypothetical scenario of fitting 4 times the proposed plan is not in keeping with the zoning.

**Peter VanDerKoy, PP, AICP**, from Matrix New World Engineering, was sworn in, reviewed his qualifications, was accepted by the Board and gave the following testimony:

Mr. VanDerKoy reviewed his findings with respect to the positive and negative criteria. He stated the granting the deviation variance far outweighs the detriments. The *2010 Housing Plan Element and Fair Share Plan* identifies this property as a suitable site for affordable housing, as well as the *New Amwell Redevelopment Plan*.

BREAK

Mr. Boccanfuso asked if he could speak to the zoning with respect to the Redevelopment Plan and any restrictions in place for the development of the rear tract.

Mr. VanDerKoy stated the Redevelopment Plan contains detailed bulk density standards. The permitted uses of the rear property, which is not the subject of this application, includes single-family homes and townhomes. The density of the single-family homes is 6.5 acres, with a maximum of 7 dwelling units per acre. Townhouse units have a maximum of 2.5 acres, with a permitted density of 16 units per acre. The Redevelopment Plan calls for a maximum development of 75 units on the site.

Mr. Bernstein said, as per the Redevelopment Plan, the maximum number of units on the entire site is 129, 54 on the front property, and 75 on the back property.

Chairman Sireci said the Redevelopment Plan has already been determined. The development of the entire property is not the responsibility of this Applicant, only their part of the Plan.

Mr. Bernstein stated the only reason why the rear property is being commented on is because the public has raised questions as it relates to this site.

**Bill Tretheway**

□ Mr. Tretheway asked for clarification as to whether or not this application involves a minor subdivision.

Mr. VanDerKoy stated the subdivision also involves the back lot but that the site plan only involves the front property.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 25, 2015**

□ Mr. Tretheway continued with questions about the access regarding the rear property. Mr. Bernstein stated that if access becomes an issue, it would be a separate issue with the developer in question and the municipality, not with this Applicant.

Close Public

Mr. Bernstein asked Mr. McBride, as the Applicant, if he would acknowledge to conform fully to all of the recommendations and reports of the Board Engineer, Board Planner, any other reports of the Municipality, County or State agency, related thereto, as well as the *New Amwell Redevelopment Plan*.

Mr. McBride agreed.

A motion to approve Amwell Commons (RPM Development, LLC) was made by Mr. Julian, seconded by Dr. Marulli.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Wagner - yes; Dr. Marulli - yes; Mr. Julian - yes; Mr. Peason - yes; Chairman Sireci - yes. Motion carries.

Mr. Bernstein reviewed upcoming meeting dates with the Board.

A motion to cancel the July 02, 2015 meeting was made by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Dr. Marulli. All were in favor; none opposed. Motion carries.

Chairman Sireci said the next meeting will be held on July 9<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 10:08 p.m.

*Submitted by:*  
*Debora Padgett*  
*Administrative Assistant / Planning Board Clerk*