Chairman Campeas called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and read the opening statement that adequate notice of the meeting had been posted and sent to the officially designated newspapers.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Campeas; Vice Chairman Roberts; Mr. DeRochi; Mayor Jaffer; Mr. Mani; Mr. Matthews; Mr. Schuldiner; Mr. Wilson; Mr. Glockler, Alternate #1; Mr. Conry, Alternate #2; Mr. Laskey, Advisor

ALSO PRESENT: Francis P. Linnus, Esquire, Board Attorney; Rakesh Darji, Board Engineer; Michael Sullivan, Board Planner; Lori Savron, Planning Director

I.  SALUTE TO THE FLAG

II.  PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - None

III. INFORMAL REVIEW

Case PB-01-19  Applicant: The Haven at Princeton, LLC
Block 37003 Lot 7 – 460 River Road
Informal Site Plan and Subdivision with Professional Review

Mr. Linnus described the conceptual review process.

Richard Schatzman, Esquire, David Schmidt, PE and Cliff Horner, AIA represented the applicant.

Mr. Schatzman said the proposal is for 100 townhouse units and 70 apartments of which 34 are affordable units for a total of 170 units.

Mr. Schmidt referenced a plan entitled “Map of Survey Wetland Delineation Plan” dated October 9, 2017 revised through October 1, 2018. The project is known as Haven at Princeton. The property is located on the west side of River Road. The lot is 73.9724 acres and is zoned APT/TH. There is an office building with an asphalt entrance and associated parking currently on the site. Wastewater management will be handled by the Stage II Treatment Plant. The critical areas on the site include Flood Hazard Area, 100-year Floodplain, 100-foot Montgomery and Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission Stream Corridor, wetlands, wetland buffer areas of 150 feet, steep slopes and critical soils. A Letter of Interpretation was issued by NJDEP on October 24, 2018. The proposed concept plan excludes all the critical areas. The site is mostly wooded except the center portion which is maintained lawn. The developable portion of the property is approximately 20 acres. Mr. Schmidt referenced the plan entitled “Conceptual Site Plan Haven at Princeton” dated December 17, 2018. The maximum number of units permitted by ordinance is 8 units per acre of non-critical area and 1/5 unit per acre for critical lands or a total of 170 units. The project will be constructed in two or three phases. The applicant agreed to all the comments in the Clarke Caton Hintz memo dated March 14, 2019. It is anticipated that the proposal will not require any variances.

Mr. Horner testified the townhouses will be three bedrooms, two baths and a two car garage. The two larger apartment buildings will contain both the market rate and 30 affordable units. There is discussion about putting 4 of the affordable units in the existing building. The facades of the buildings will be a mixture of vinyl siding and stone to complement the existing building. There will be 108 3-bedroom units which includes the 100 townhouses, 47 2-bedroom units and 15 1-bedroom units. The buildings will comply with the height requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Sullivan suggested they use some sort of cement fiber clapboard instead of vinyl because of its durability over time.

Mr. Wilson asked why the project is named Haven at Princeton instead of Haven at Montgomery. Mr. Schmidt said it has a Princeton mailing address.
Mr. DeRochi said the building elevations need a lot of work. They should have balconies for the upper units that are deep enough to have furniture. There should be more of a buffer to minimize the visual impact of the buildings along River Road.

Ms. Roberts asked about the smell from the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Mr. Schmidt said he would work with Mr. Cosgrove to see if the issue could be addressed. There was discussion how it is the Princeton plant that omits the odor.

Mr. Glockler asked if the COAH units are in the apartments or mixed throughout the whole development. Ms. Savron said they are mixed in both rental apartment buildings. Mr. Glockler asked Mr. Sullivan about his comment about striping the intersections rather than using a different type of paving. Mr. Sullivan explained that from a durability standpoint the differential pavement doesn’t hold up to snow plowing etc. which is a maintenance issue.

Mr. Darji said he likes the idea of the bioretention basins but is a little concerned with the depth of seasonal high water table. Mr. Schmidt said porous pavement on the alleys is an option. The details will be worked out as the engineering plans are developed. The Homeowners Association will be responsible for the maintenance of the detention basins. The applicant should contact Gail Smith, the Township Engineer, to see if any improvements would be required to the sewer facilities.

Mr. Glockler asked about the portion of the property not being developed. Mr. Schatzman said it will go into a conservation easement or deed restriction conservation area. Mr. Glockler asked if they considered a walking trail. Mr. Schmidt said he did not want to go through the DEP permitting for a trail. Mr. Sullivan said he really wanted to develop a fairly robust perimeter recreational or multi-use path that would be on the boundary of the developed area.

Chairman Campeas opened the meeting to the public.

Lori Lerner, Andover Circle, is concerned with the traffic that this development will generate and its impact to the area. This project could potentially bring 400 more cars. When River Road is closed from flooding, Blue Spring Road is used as a bypass. The project does not benefit the community that lives in the area.

Ms. Roberts said the Township had hoped to purchase the property for open space but the property owner was not interested. The property owner has the right to build what is permitted by ordinance.

Mr. Linnus and Mr. Schatzman agreed that there is case law that says an approval cannot be turn down that conforms to the zoning because of traffic. However, the Board could condition the approval.

Amelia Taylor, 16B Andover Circle, is concerned with noise from the Trap Rock Quarry and whether it would be affected by the various paved surfaces. She is also concerned with the increase in traffic. The property would make a beautiful park and should be preserved as open space. A bike lane should be installed along River Road.

Frank Wiechnik, 511 River Road, said a sidewalk along River Road is needed that is wide enough for two people to walk side by side. Mr. Schmidt said they could look at installing sidewalk within the property but not within the right-of-way.

Margaret Plantis, Andover Circle, is also concerned about the effect on the existing community this development would have.

Mr. Linnus explained that the property is zoned Apartment and Townhouses. The density is in accordance with the ordinance and at this point there are no variances required. The powers of the Planning Board are limited to the extent that if the applicant presents an as of right plan the Board powers are circumscribed.

Ms. Savron gave an overview of the Township Master Plan and Zone Plan.

Amelia Taylor asked if this property was originally on the Township’s conservation plan. Mayor Jaffer replied that it was on the plan but the plan is a wish list. Ms. Taylor asked if the property was farmland assessed. Ms. Savron said it might have been. If the property is developed, roll back taxes will be levied and then future taxes will be based on residential use.
Barbara Kennedy, Andover Circle, asked the price point of the townhouses and apartments. Chairman Campeas informed her it hasn’t been determined. Mr. Sullivan said the affordable housing is rental and the rent is a fraction of the median income of the County.

Margaret Plantes asked if a Market Analysis was done to determine if there is a need for this housing. Mr. Schatzman informed her that the developer has done an analysis.

Mr. Wiechnik asked if the Township could request the two apartment buildings be removed from River Road. Mr. Sullivan said when the plan was developed they didn’t want the apartments between the existing and proposed townhouses.

The Board took a five minute recess.

IV. APPOINTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES UNDER THE “LOCAL PAY-TO-PLAY LAW”

Ms. Savron read the resolution to appoint Remington & Vernick Engineers as Completing Engineer for all the projects that have been approved by the Board and are under conformance review.

A motion to approve the resolution was made by Mr. Mani and seconded by Mr. Schuldiner. The motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Campeas, DeRochi, Jaffer, Mani, Matthews, Roberts, Schuldiner, Wilson and Glockler
Nays: None

V. ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Land Development Ordinance No. 19-1604

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING CHAPTER XVI, ENTITLED "LAND DEVELOPMENT", OF THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MONTGOMERY (1984), COUNTY OF SOMERSET, STATE OF NEW JERSEY, ESTABLISHING STANDARDS FOR UNCONNECTED DRIVE-IN BANK BUILDING/STRUCTURES IN THE NC, CC-1, CC2 AND HC ZONING DISTRICTS

Ms. Savron summarized the ordinance. The Board found the ordinance is substantially consistent with the Master Plan.

A motion to recommend the ordinance as written was made by Mr. DeRochi and seconded by Ms. Roberts. The motion carried on the following:

Ayes: Campeas, DeRochi, Jaffer, Mani, Matthews, Roberts, Schuldiner, Wilson and Glockler
Nays: None

B. Land Development Ordinance No. 19-1605


Ms. Savron summarized the ordinance. The Board found the ordinance is substantially consistent with the Master Plan.

A motion to recommend the ordinance as written was made by Mr. DeRochi and seconded by Ms. Roberts. The motion carried on the following:

Ayes: Campeas, DeRochi, Jaffer, Mani, Matthews, Roberts, Schuldiner, Wilson and Glockler
Nays: None
VI. MINUTES

February 4, 2019 – Regular Meeting

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Mani and seconded by Mr. Glockler. The motion carried on the following roll call vote:
Ayes: Conry, DeRochi, Glockler, Jaffer, Mani, Matthews, Roberts, Wilson and Campeas
Nays: None

VII. CLOSED SESSION

Ms. Savron read the resolution to close the meeting to the public so that the Board could discuss the appointment of the Board Attorney.

The Board unanimously voted to go into closed session.

A motion to reopen the meeting was made by Vice Chairman Roberts and seconded by Mr. Glockler. The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.