

Hightstown Planning Board
Regular Meeting
August 12, 2019, 7:30 p.m.

OPEN SESSION

Chairman, Fred Montferrat called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m. and read the Open Public Meetings Act statement: "Adequate notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, pursuant to Public Law 1975, Chapter 231. Said notice was sent to the Trenton Times and the Windsor-Hights Herald and is posted in the Borough Clerk's Office."

Flag Salute

Roll Call

	PRESENT	ABSENT	LATE ARRIVAL
Mr. Montferrat, Chairman	X		
Mayor Quattrone	X		
Councilman Misiura	X		
Ms. Asselstine		X	
Ms. Colavecchio	X		
Ms. Jackson	X		
Mr. Rosenberg		X	
Mr. Searing	X		
Mr. Cicalese	X		
Mr. Balcewicz, Alt. #1		X	
Mr. Cabot, Alt. #2		X	

Also in attendance: Sandy Belan, Planning Board Secretary. Jolanta Maziarz, Planning Board Attorney, Carmela Roberts, Planning Board Engineer and Brian Slaugh, Planning Board Planner.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Montferrat asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Motion made by Mayor Quattrone and seconded by Mr. Misiura to approve the agenda.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Montferrat, Mayor Quattrone, Mr. Misiura, Ms. Colavecchio, Ms. Jackson, Mr. Searing and Mr. Cicalese voted yes. Ms. Asselstine, Mr. Rosenberg, Mr. Cabot and Mr. Balcewicz were absent. Motion passed 7-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Montferrat asked if there were any corrections or comments to the minutes of the July 8, 2019, Regular Meeting.

Motion made by Ms. Colavecchio and seconded by Mr. Cicalese to approve the July 8, 2019, Planning Board minutes as amended by the Board attorney.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Montferrat, Mayor Quattrone, Ms. Colavecchio, Mr. Searing and Mr. Cicalese voted yes. Mr. Misiura and Ms. Jackson abstained. Ms. Asselstine, Mr. Rosenberg, Mr. Cabot and Mr. Balcewicz were absent. Motion passed 5-0 and two abstentions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Montferrat opened the floor for any public comments on items not on the agenda.

There being no public comment. Mr. Montferrat closed the public comments portion of the meeting.

HEARING

Springpoint at Meadow Lakes, Inc., 200 Etra Road, Block 63.01, Lot 45 – Application for Amended Preliminary and Final Site Plan with Variances:

- 1) Bulk variances and exceptions, as follows:
 - a) Exceeding the maximum number of units in one building: Permitted maximum: 4; Proposed: 40;
 - b) Exceeding the maximum allowable lot coverage: Permitted: 25%; Existing: 24.1%; Proposed: 27%;
 - c) Insufficient parking under the Residential Site Improvement Standards (“RSIS”); Required: 74 spaces; Proposed: 50 spaces

Kenneth Pape, Attorney, Heilbrunn & Pape representing the applicant.

Mr. Montferrat confirmed the receipt of notices and that jurisdiction has been established. At this time Councilman Steve Misiura recused himself.

Mr. Pape gave an overview of the property. This is an age-restricted planned residential retirement community. Property is Zoned R-PE – (planned residential elderly zoning district) – provision in that zone for the number of units to be constructed in any given building. Question posed to the Planning Board – is the Board sitting tonight as a Planning Board or a Zoning Board of Adjustment. We are prepared either way. We believe that it should be acting as a Planning Board, and the use is one that is contemplated in the zone. The only elements that are not met are the number of units in the building, which I would characterize as a Bulk Variance, not a D-1 Use Variance. Mr. Pape asked that the Board discuss this prior to the beginning of testimony. The notices prepared are inclusive.

Ms. Maziarz – The Planning Board will make this interpretation in order to determine if you are sitting as the Planning Board or the Zoning Board of Adjustment. I do not believe what Mr. Pape is asking for an interpretation because that is a function of the Zoning Board only. However, the Planning Board does have the power to interpret ordinances on applications before the Planning Board. The Board must make a determination as to whether this Zoning Ordinance requires that those attributes are included in the principal permitted uses. I tend to agree. The way the ordinances are written those attributes are permissive and constructive, but they are not mandatory. From a legal standpoint, I would recommend that it is permissible and not mandatory, and therefore, not a substantial attribute of that physical permitted use.

Subsection 28-3-10 – R-PE Planned Residential – Elderly District.

1. Permitted Uses:
 - (a) Residences for the elderly; retirement communities.
 - i. (1) Residences for the elderly or retirement communities, subject to site plan approval by the Planning Board, which **may** take the form of:
 - (i) Townhouses, provided that a maximum of three (3) houses **may** be in a single row.
 - (ii) Multifamily dwellings, provided that a maximum of four (4) units **may** be in a single building.

If the Board agrees that this is the way the Borough intended this to be read and applied, then you may sit as a Planning Board and not Zoning Board.

Mr. Slauch noted as a Planner I tend to take a more conservative course. The type of principal use – “single building” would be permitted. The D-1 variance on principal structure side. From a practical aspect it is easier to determine as a C-variance.

The Board recommended it be treated as a C-Variance rather than a D-1 Variance.

Mr. Pape introduced the professionals who are present and may testify.

Heather Hill-Falkoff, Director, Development Services, Springpoint at Meadow Lakes, Inc.

Brenden Garozzo, Executive Director – Meadow Lakes
Kevin Webb, PE, LEED, AP, Applicant's Engineer, Langan Engineering & Environmental Services
Sean Moronski, PP, Applicant's Planner, Langan Engineering & Environmental Services
Karl Pehnke, P.E., PTOE, Traffic Engineer, Langan Engineering & Environmental Services
Michael Allen-Hall, AIA, Architect, Noelker and Hull Associates, Inc.
Joe Greipp, Arborist, Arboretum Director, Meadow Lakes

Ms. Maziarz – The Application will be heard as a Preliminary & Final Site Plan with Variances, not Amended Preliminary & Final Site Plan with Variances.

Kevin Webb, Engineer – Mr. Webb was sworn in by Ms. Maziarz. Credentials: Professional Engineer licensed in New Jersey since 1997. Bachelor of Science from Bucknell University 1992. Presented before numerous planning and zoning boards throughout the state. I am responsible for the plans being presented tonight. The Board accepts Mr. Webb as an expert witness.

Following Exhibits will be presented:

- A-1 – Meadow Lakes New Independent Living Building – Overall Conditions Plan, August 12, 2019
- A-2 – Meadow Lakes New Independent Living Building – Existing Condition Plan, August 12, 2019
- A-3 – Meadow Lakes New Independent Living Building – Conceptual Plan Rendering, August 12, 2019
- A-4 – Meadow Lakes I. L. Apartments, Springpoint Senior Living, Exterior Elevations (1A, 1B, 2 and 3), August 12, 2019
- A-5 – Meadow Lakes I. L. Apartments, Springpoint Senior Living, Exterior Elevations (4, 5, & 6), August 12, 2019
- A-6 – Meadow Lakes I. L. Apartments, Springpoint Senior Living, Existing Elevations, August 12, 2019
- A-7 – Meadow Lakes I. L. Apartments, Springpoint Senior Living, Exterior Rendering, August 12, 2019

Exhibit A-1 – Aerial photo of Meadow Lakes campus. Mr. Webb gave an overview of Exhibit A-1.

Exhibit A-2 – Enlargement of A-1 version to show the Hightstown Borough portion. Mr. Webb gave an overview of Exhibit A-2.

Exhibit A-3 – Meadow Lakes – Conceptual Plan Rendering - Buildings 0, 1, 2 & 3 in the central portion of the lot will be demolished and replaced by a new two-story building with 40 units. Proposing surface parking lot to serve the new building and adjacent builds. Reviewed the statutes they will address regarding Site Plan:

1. Grading
2. Drainage
3. Lighting
4. Landscaping
5. Parking
6. Circulation
7. Signage

Mr. Webb acknowledged receipt of the Borough's professional reports from the planner and engineer. The reports have been reviewed and met with the professionals to discuss.

Mr. Webb testified to the following:

- 1) Grading – Relatively minor changes to the grading, but grading is an important aspect to the plans and relates somewhat to some of the more subtle changes to the project. The existing conditions (Exhibit A-2) – some of these independent buildings that I mentioned are one and two story buildings throughout the campus; on some (Building 5) there are one story exposed on the west side, but actually two stories exposed on the east side. The corridor that connects Building 6 & 5 acts as a retaining wall. The area in the courtyard that is north is 6-7 feet higher than the courtyard on the interior of the building. Around building 2, which will be demolished, there are also some retaining walls with several grading changes. There are also several existing trees within this area as well. The factor in our design is understanding where we can place the building and ways we can grade around the building to minimize the overall disturbance, particularly in the areas of those existing trees that have been identified as valuable and worth saving. We have worked extensively with the Arboretum Director to identify and prioritize the existing trees.

Exhibit A-3 – We have lost that physical connection to Building 5, where there is separation. We still have an area to maintain the grading (surface parking lot and the connection to perimeter road), that is a relatively higher elevation and make connections for the fire lane as proposed between the new building and building 5 and 6 into the interior courtyard. We have a sloping portion of the fire lane. We want to ensure that we preserve these existing trees, including the one tree (Willow Oak). We have found a way architecturally to minimize the amount of grading in this area, minimize both the horizontal and vertical changes in grading to protect these trees. This building the north wing is pointing to the west wing. Southern portion of the west wing, the western portion of the southern wing and to a similar degree on the eastern face. We have kept the ground low and the building higher. Areas of patios where you can walk out of the unit and higher elevated areas will have a railing. Height varies from 2 to 2.5 feet up to 3 to 6. More extreme on the eastern face of the southern wing, constraints of the DRCC Conservation Easement.

Previously, there was a connection with Building 5. This will allow connection to Building 21 and 23. This is critical to the functionality of this building because it is through that building connection that residents will have covered walkway and access to all the campus amenities.

2. Drainage – Mr. Webb – The system is entirely privately owned, and the applicant will be responsible for the maintenance. System is designed to be consistent with DEP and Borough regulations.

Ms. Roberts confirmed in her report dated July 25, 2019, that the Stormwater Management Report submitted is in compliance with the Borough's stormwater standard for water quantity and quality.

3. Lighting – The lighting plan consists of 12 pole mounted lights entirely within the parking area and bollard style lights along the pedestrian walkways that provide access to the apartments. These lights match the current fixtures throughout the campus. There is no light overflow beyond the parking lot, and no impact to adjacent residential properties. Light fixture design incorporates a dawn to dusk photocell.
4. Landscaping – No additional buffering plants have been added to the site's perimeter. We feel the site is adequately buffered. We have identified and proposed plantings along the perimeter – street trees in parking of our redevelopment area – Perimeter Road so we can create a microenvironment. Working around consistent trees and augmenting those. We have proposed a certain number of street trees within the parking lot. Proposed significant amount of foundation planting on the buildings themselves. We have tried to leave some flexibility at the request of the Arboretum Director. We want to see how the new plantings grow throughout this microenvironment to insure what is working. This is consistent with the way the campus is managed, to control what works well and to identify, protect those species that are unique and to manage the entire campus area. What we have done goes beyond the bare minimum. I believe we have adequate landscaping that will certainly be augmented over time as the community continues to grow.

Mr. Webb reviewed some of the proposed landscaping planned:

15 trees (half street/half ornamental)
400 shrubs
1200 planting perennials and ornamental grasses

5. Parking – Mr. Pape stated that the client has identified their parking needs for the residents, visitors, personal service contractors and medical providers. The applicant has maintained detailed records over the years which were used to determine the parking needs. The proposed parking is not necessarily to a standard that is published. There is a reasonable amount of parking that is intended to be commensurate with our client's directions.

Mr. Webb testified that new parking adjacent to the building will have 50 spaces (44 regular and 6 handicap). This number meets the Borough ordinance standard of one per unit, which is inclusive of visitors and support service. From Meadow Lakes prospective, they feel that the 50 (1.25 spaces) per unit is more appropriate. The demand of individual units and individual residents' changes over time (some may currently have a car but may transition out of that as they age in place). There is always a demand for visitors and guests, also people that provide services to the individual residents that go above and beyond what they provide to the entire campus - medical personnel (nurses, home health aides and therapists) are there daily. We feel the 1.25 parking spaces is more appropriate to accommodate the daily demand. We know we will be safe and be able to accommodate the residents and the services, but also balance what is an appropriate number. This is one of the significant

changes we have made from the original application, at the request of your Board professionals. We reevaluated and feel this is a more accurate number and will reduce impervious coverage overall. Also allows us to have a more efficient and appropriate design within the space (several cramped spaces toward Perimeter Road, which were less than ideal in terms of design). All spaces provided are 9' X 20'.

Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) demand for senior living apartments would be as high at 74 spaces. We do not think we are anywhere near that number. I believe the testimony given supports our request for a de minimis exception from the requirements of the RSIS.

Circulation Pattern - Mr. Webb reviewed the current property conditions – Perimeter Road provides access to Etra Road – two driveways on Etra Road Main Site driveway and secondary driveway within Hightstown Borough, which is connected by Perimeter Road to the rest of the campus. The existing area being redeveloped does have the surface parking lot, turnaround in front of the guest houses and some adjacent spaces.

Exhibit A-3 – We are not making any changes to the Perimeter Road (site circulation will be unchanged). We have a larger parking lot, but feel it is a safer and more efficient operation based on the circular driveway. This design provides additional parking closer to the units.

Per the request of the Borough Fire Chief and other professionals, the fire lane has been revised to provide access to the interior courtyard. A 20-foot wide fire lane has been provided which was a critical part of the design element. The proposed fire lane is comprised of a 12-foot wide reinforced concrete center section flanked on both sides by 4-foot wide strip of grass pavers that would accommodate the outrigger fire truck. We have stabilized the area for the fire trucks.

The fire lane has been designed in conjunction with the architect to provide access to the new building but also to the existing buildings.

6. Signage – Mr. Webb testified that there will be no new signage.

Mr. Webb stated that he is familiar with the Board's professional reports and will address the open technical requirements to the satisfaction of the Board's professionals.

Mr. Slauch asked Mr. Webb regarding railings for proposed retaining walls.

Mr. Webb – northern courtyard sloping toward Building 5 has a low-level retaining wall. Will agree to add railing as requested by Board professionals.

Mr. Slauch asked how the parking lot size was determined?

Mr. Webb – At the direction of the client to provide parking for residents, visitors, contractors who come to the site, medical staff. It was based on careful records maintained by the client over the years.

Mr. Searing asked if the Fire Chief reviewed the plans and is satisfied? Mr. Webb – Yes, they Fire Chief is satisfied with the plan. Fire hydrants will be added as necessary per the fire chief's recommendations.

Joseph Greipp, Arboretum Director, Resident Meadow Lakes Arborist – Mr. Greipp was sworn in by Ms. Maziarz. Credentials – Rutgers University Bachelor of Science in Environmental Planning & Design. Board certified master arborist, member of the National Society of Horticulture, licensed tree expert and served on several boards. Board accepts Mr. Greipp as an expert witness.

Mr. Greipp – I have worked at Meadow Lakes for 12 years. Responsible for the management of the campus, primarily living materials. Actively involved in the tree maintenance and preservation throughout the site. Reviewed and discussed the site plan with the Meadow Lakes professionals, and I am comfortable that my guidance was followed. We provide minimal landscaping in order to offer flexibility to the new residents – design based on personal likes. This allows more flexibility to add additional plants as needed.

Meadow Lake Arboretum is an accredited Level 2 Arboretum, which is an international accreditation. Started with 170 unique species and now have over 5,000 total and 400 unique species. We offer training and outreach education. Private arboretum which is open to the public by appointment. Provide tours to local clubs and schools.

Mr. Greipp stated that he was comfortable with Mr. Webb's comments regarding the grading and landscaping and was comfortable with the design for the site.

Mr. Slaugh is there was an overall theme for the arboretum?

Mr. Greipp – It is a mature landscaping design featuring a hierarchy of plants and materials old and rare and unique trees. Specialize in oak trees (test disease resistance).

Mr. Webb – We are removing more trees than we are replacing in order to provide a blank canvas to work with.

Mayor Quattrone – Can you give a percentage of the canopy coverage? Mr. Greipp will provide that information.

Ms. Jackson asked if the Environmental Commission has reviewed the Plans? Ms. Belan confirmed that the Environmental Commission did receive the plans and provided comments.

Mr. Pape noted that Mr. Greipp has a family obligation and asked the chairman to open public comment on this topic.

Mr. Montferrat opened the meeting for any public comment on the landscaping portion of the project.

There being no public comment, Mr. Montferrat closed this portion of the public comment.

Sean Moronski, PP, Langan Engineering & Environmental Services was sworn in by Ms. Maziarz. Credentials – Master's Degree Urban Planning from New York University, member of the American Institute of Certified Planners since 1999, New Jersey Licensed Professional Planner since 2000; testified before 100 Planning and Zoning Board and Municipalities throughout New Jersey. This is the first time testifying in Hightstown. Also served as a municipal planner for several municipalities in northern and central New Jersey. The Board accepts Mr. Moronski as an expert witness.

Mr. Moronski – In preparation to testify, I reviewed the application package which included the site and architectural plans and other documentation that accompanied the application. Also reviewed the Board's professional responses. Reviewed the relevant portion of the zoning ordinance, Master Plan and Residential Site Improvements Standards Guide. I also visited the site and the surrounding area twice. Consulted with the client and other professionals in preparation for this meeting.

Applicant also shared the goals for this project: Update existing Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC). To replace independent units that are currently vacant with new modern independent living units at the same scale (two-story building height). To improve interior connections within the complex, so tenants have more efficient access to the central part of the CCRC where the core services are (dining, community meeting areas and health care). Add additional parking spaces where there are currently not enough and make them more convenient to potential residents, improve site circulation, not just in terms of vehicular drop off (coming and going at the front door), but also the pedestrian circulation within the complex.

Mr. Moronski gave an overview of the improvements proposed: Currently 21 vacant units which will be removed. The proposal is to replace them with one independent living building that will contain 40 units and be connected to the other buildings. The purpose is to provide newer independent living uses. This will increase the number of units by 19 overall. The 19 units added will increase the density approximately 5.1 units per acre; maximum density in this zone is 14 units per acre. Proposing 50 parking spaces; 1.25 spaces per unit (residents, visitors, contractors and vendors). This number was reduced after consultations with the Board's professionals as stated by Mr. Webb. The ground disturbance for the most part is limited to an area where there has already been a substantial degree of development, primarily the buildings that are being removed from the site.

Zoning Analysis – Three C Variances which can be granted under the C2 criteria – granting the variance outweigh any detriments.

- 1) Number of Units in the Building – ordinance talks about a maximum of four may be in the building. Proposing 40 units within one building. Three buildings with units are being replaced.
- 2) Variance for Maximum Coverage – 25% is the maximum; 24.1% exists and 27% is proposed on the site
- 3) Parking Requirements – Borough requires 50 spaces for the 78 independent units; we are providing 50 spaces for the 78 independent living uses that are within the Hightstown portion of the project. We are required to provide one space per unit per Borough ordinance.
- 4) Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) - Requesting a de minimis exception Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) - RSIS requirements are 74 spaces, whereas 50 spaces are being proposed.

Mr. Moronski testified that the buildings being removed have eight to twelve units which is consistent with the other independent living units on site which have a range of eight to twelve units as well. The proposed building is two-stories per height requirement and is designed to be consistent with the building design of the overall CCRC site and the same scale. The internal connections to the core services for the CCRC are being improved and will be more efficient for residents to more easily access the daily aspect of life – dining, community center, health and other services needed. The net increase in units is about 19 units – density would be 5.1 units per acre.

Mr. Moronski testified regarding maximum coverage – net increase for coverage is approximately 22,864 sq. ft. (a little over half an acre of the 18.1-acre site). The additional coverage helps to add more parking spaces which address the need to provide more convenient easily accessible spaces for the units that are proposed, not only in terms of the residents but visitors and professional and contractors who are providing services to the residents. The additional coverage is in the general area where the existing buildings are being removed. Currently there are 12 parking spaces with the existing buildings.

With regards to parking requirements – we are improving an existing condition. The current parking at the building is 12 units, we are increasing that to 50. We are also adjusting the drop off area to be safer and more efficient with two egress and ingress driveways. Additional spaces for professional consultants, which accommodates one per unit, but also accommodates other visitors to the site. As part of the parking lot design, when you enter through the south driveway, there is a portion that provides access to the new fire road, which is going to improve emergency access to the site.

We must prove several purposes: zoning:

- Purpose (a) Appropriate use of the lands contributing to the general welfare – more independent and modern units contribute to the additional housing. Additional coverage improves the parking and provides emergency access.
- Purpose (b) Secure from flood, fire and panic – proposed design includes fire road and parking lot which improves emergency access to the surrounding multi-family buildings
- Purpose (g) Providing enough space for a variety of housing types – The CCRC already provides a range of housing types. The site area with the multi-family development is proposed. It will be modernized and additionally used to address current demands for the senior population, will improve the flow of traffic, additional parking spaces available to residents and visitors as well as improved circulation and drop off for the new parking area.
- Purpose (i) Encourage senior center housing construction be independent – this contributes to that as well.

Address the negative:

1. No substantial detriment to the public good. The development occurs already in an area that is developed. Provide more independent living units to the benefit of the overall site as well as additional parking spaces to address those units. The building design is of the same scale as other independent living buildings in the CCRC (two-story building). As Mr. Webb testified it was designed to address the stormwater requirements in terms of the impact of the additional impervious coverage.
2. No substantial detriment to the Zoning Ordinance or the Master Plan – independent living, as part of the CCRC, is a permitted use. We meet the density requirement – maximum residential density of 14 dwelling units per acre. Based

upon an approximate lot area of 18 acres, a total of 252 dwelling units are permitted on this tract. Proposing additional 40 units which would bring the total to 94 units (15 single-family detached dwellings and 39 apartment units for a total of 54 current units). The proposed gross density is approximately 3 dwelling units per acre.

There are several objectives listed in the Master Plan Reexamination Report:

Objective #3.5 – Provide a reasonable mix of housing of all ages and income levels – The CCRC is providing a range of senior citizen housing options, enhancing the independent living.

Objective #3.9 – Encourage housing design and site plans that promote social, family friendly community behavior. The design is integrated into the CCRC, preserves open space connections and is developed at the same scale as the development.

Objective #3.14 – Promote well landscaped lots that create an appealing residential streetscape appearance. The building and site design will be consistent with the plan for the landscaping in the CCRC.

The required off-street parking for the proposed apartments is 74 spaces, resulting in a deficiency of at least 24 spaces. Under the statute, the Board may grant a de minimis exception from the requirements of RSIS only if the literal enforcement of the standards is impracticable or will exact undue hardship due to peculiar conditions pertaining to the development in question.

The exception is what impact granting the exception will cause by not granting those number of spaces. Retirement communities refer to what's considered an analogies housing choice and they use garden apartments. One bedroom is 1.8 spaces; two bedrooms is 2 spaces which is well above the ordinance requirements for Hightstown. It is also well above what we are proposing.

Board criteria we must show that granting of the de minimis exception would be consistent with the Site Improvement Act:

Purpose #6 – “To provide the widest possible range of design freedom and promote diversity through performance-oriented site improvement standards.” The proposal improves the existing condition, it adds more spaces in an area that will be appropriately used by the residents of that building. It does not adversely impact any environmental sensitive areas and does not have a substantial detriment on the surrounding development.

Second Criteria – “It's reasonable, limited, and not unduly burdensome.” – The proposed spaces improve the existing parking conditions on that part of the site. What we are proposing exceeds the Borough's standard for the new units. Meets the needs of public health and safety. Site design will improve access with two ingress/egress driveways as well as access to improved fire road and considers existing infrastructure and possible surrounding development. The proposed building and the parking area developed on this portion of the site already has buildings and parking driveways. Future development is limited by the state constraints as well as any environmental restraints. I believe we have met the four criteria required to meet the RSIS de minimis exception.

Board and Professional Questions:

Mr. Slauch – Asked how the age of the residents have changed over the years?

Mr. Moronski - In a meeting with Heather Hill-Falk we discussed this: average age is 80's, some residents as young as 60 and a few in their 100's. Eighty is a median age. The residents' ages did help to formulate the number of parking spaces. Many residents are still living independently and still active and may certainly have one or more cars. There are also outside service providers – health care and personal care professionals who come to assist the residents. The current parking lot has 12 spaces, which fills up very quickly and is not conveniently located. The other parking is far from the site. From a functional prospective what is being proposed is an improvement in terms of parking and drop off.

Mr. Moronski reviewed - Impervious Coverage – Exhibit A-3 – fire lane.

August 12, 2019

Mr. Pape asked for a five-minute break prior to the additional testimony.

After a five-minute break Mr. Pape called Michael Allen-Hall, AIA, Noelker and Hull, Associates, Inc.

Michael Allen-Hall, AIA, Noelker and Hull, Associates, Inc. was sworn in by Ms. Maziarz. Credentials and qualifications: Principal architect in charge of senior living for Noelker and Hull since 1996 and a principal since 1998. Licensed for 34 years in the State of New Jersey plus 14 other states. Bachelor and Master's Degree in Architecture from Oklahoma State University. I have been working for Springpoint since 2012 including Meadow Lakes. Started working on this site in 2015. I have testified before other boards. Board accepts Mr. Allen-Hall as a Licensed Architect to testify as an expert witness.

Mr. Allen-Hall testified that an integral part of the process was to integrate the new building into the existing campus at Meadow Lakes. Buildings 0, 1, 2 and 3 were built in the early 1960's. The independent living market is now somewhat different. Primarily seniors now look for larger and open plan concept with accessibility throughout the entire site. Exhibit A-1 – everything is connected by corridors. The new design shortens the connection. One of the differences between the early 1960's and now is the average age of seniors has increased. Their ability to walk further is not the same as it was in the 1960's.

Mr. Pape asked Mr. Allen-Hall to discuss the tools used to create this building in a manner that was harmonious with the existing community.

Mr. Allen-Hall – Exhibit A-1 – all the residential buildings on the campus are oriented north/south with connected walkways and common spaces. Exhibit A-6 – photos of existing buildings on the campus. We wanted to be true to the planning module and character of the buildings (mid-century modern; horizontal, low roofs). Building colors mostly brick stained with siding and large windows throughout.

Mr. Allen-Hall reviewed Exhibit A-4 Exterior Elevation of the buildings – maintain the character of the existing buildings. Exhibit A-7 Exterior Rendering – this is an actual placement of building on the site. The architecture of the new building creates a harmonious character with the current site.

Mr. Allen-Hall testified to the firefighting methodology incorporated into this design – building totally sprinklered as per NFPA 13, in addition there is a full fire alarm system and smoke detectors in the building. The building is separated into two areas by a two-hour firewall, one in the middle of the building and the other is separating the new building from the existing Building #23.

Sprinkler system has been added in addition to the two-hour firewall. Between the parking lot and the fire lane it covers over 2/3 accessibility to the building, which is a specific element of the site plan.

Mr. Allen-Hall testified regarding the lighting mounted on the buildings (purpose and intensity). There are three types of lighting. On each of the residential balconies there are downlights in the soffit of the balcony over the first floor and in the roof that overhangs the second balcony. These are downlights that bring the lighting directly down. Outdoor sconces in the stairwell by the doors and outdoor sconces pointed down certified to be dark skies.

Mr. Slauch asked what the exterior finish on the foundation would be? Mr. Allen-Hall – Exhibit A-4 – reviewed Exhibit A-4. There will be no horizontal change and will maintain the existing character throughout the site.

Branden Garozzo, Executive Director, Meadow Lakes was sworn in by Ms. Maziarz. Credentials. – Mr. Garozzo has been in the industry for 25 years and with Springpoint for 21 years. Started in 1963. Mr. Garozzo testified that Meadow Lakes has been an asset to the community, employee numerous people, especially younger students in high school and college. Benefactors of a large scholarship fund. The enhancement of the campus – numerous residents take advantage of the overall grounds and the economic development. The age requirements – 62 is the move in age; average age is 83 and majority of residents are female. Provide every amenity to the residents. The original buildings (guest house and building 1, 2, & 3) were closed in 2012.

Residents were having difficulty moving around the campus (long distance) to the core (fitness center, indoor pool, café, dining room, bank, library and auditorium). This redesign allows easier access to the core facilities and amenities. In turn this has attracted more interest, which is a win for everyone. More importantly it will help the incoming clients to have new amenities and new building they can show off. The gardens and arboretum are a great asset to the overall campus. Our goal is to

revitalize the campus with new initiatives, amenities and provide a more attractive setting that also takes advantage of the lake view.

Mr. Montferrat opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

There being no public comment, Mr. Montferrat closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Professional Comments

Mr. Slauch commented that he met with the arborist at the site and reviewed the current and proposed landscaping. The concept of involving the new residents in landscaping is unique. I am satisfied that the landscaping will progress, and they have a specific plan to save and replace the trees as needed. Architectural elements – I walked the distances and understand the need to have access to the core facilities. A significant portion of my report relates to D-Variance which is no longer relevant. Testimony on the C-variances have been addressed.

Ms. Roberts – The majority of the items in my letter dated July 25, 2019, have been addressed very well. Water and sewer connection fees are required for new units. Permits from DEP required for water portion and from Mercer County and possibly ask Architectural Review Committee to review. Applicant made a nice presentation and made beautiful changes to the plan.

Board Members Comments

Board consensus is that the project was well presented – nice design, breaking up the buildings, roof lines and materials. Created a welcoming atmosphere for both residents and surrounding neighbors.

Mayor Quattrone – Meadow Lakes should be commended on the way they maintain their campus. Architectural design is beautiful and fits nicely in the area. The Mayor also suggested to draft water from the lake, which would benefit fire prevention. In the future water may be scarce. Commended Meadow Lakes for working with the professionals and the Planning Board.

Mayor would like to still know how many trees will be lost and how much coverage there is.

Mr. Montferrat – Excellent presentation – testimony presented very well and covered everything, which makes the decision making easier.

Ms. Maziarz reviewed the conditions:

Applicant agreed to address the technical comments in all the professional reports (Roberts Engineering Group LLC – dated November 30, 2018 and July 25, 2019 and Clarke Caton Hintz dated December 12, 2018 and July 26, 2019);
Comply with the Fire Chief's comments, which are also part of the engineer's reports;
Applicant agree to place a railing on the retaining wall;
Prepare estimates and make contribution (bond) in accordance with the Municipal Land Use Law

Mr. Pape informed that Board that he did not have a copy of the Fire Chief's letter. Earlier there was discussion by the fire chief to have an additional fire lane around the other side of the building. That is not something that we are prepared to do.

Ms. Roberts – The new layout addresses the fire chief's concerns.

Motion made by Mayor Quattrone and seconded by Mr. Searing to approve Springpoint Meadow Lakes, Inc., 200 Etra Road, Block 63.01, Lot 45, Application for Preliminary and Final Site Plan with Variances with the above referenced conditions.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Montferrat, Mayor Quattrone, Ms. Colavecchio, Ms. Jackson, Mr. Searing and Mr. Cicalese. Mr. Misiura recused himself. Ms. Asselstine, Mr. Rosenberg, Mr. Balcewicz and Mr. Cabot were absent. Motion passed 6-0, one abstention.

Memorialize Resolution

Resolution #2019-08 Reversing Zoning Officer Determination -- JKAMQSR, LLC
Dunkin' Donuts, 119 Franklin Street, Block 26, Lot 22.01
Appeal of the Zoning Officer's Decision dated April 29, 2019

Motion made by Ms. Colavecchio and seconded by Mr. Searing to approve Resolution #2019-08 Reversing Zoning Officer Determination – Appeal of the Zoning Officer's Decision.

Brief discussion on the proposed signage – any changes from the original site plan will require an Amended Site Plan, which includes signage.

Roll Call Vote – Mr. Montferrat, Ms. Colavecchio and Mr. Searing. Mayor Quattrone, Councilman Misiura, Ms. Jackson and Mr. Cicalese were not eligible to vote; Ms. Asselstine, Mr. Rosenberg, Mr. Balcewicz and Mr. Cabot were absent. Motion passed 3-0.

OLD BUSINESS – None

NEW BUSINESS

Mayor Quattrone appointed a subcommittee to review the undersized lots and make recommendations to revise the ordinance. Subcommittee: Mr. Musing, Ms. Bluth, Mr. Montferrat, Mr. Searing and George Chin. Mr. Slaugh will also send some suggestions on this topic to Mr. Montferrat.

Mr. Cicalese – Environmental Commission and the Complete Streets Committee did not meet last month. Attended a meeting in Trenton with Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission – Master Plan review. County Planner would like to be involved with the Technical Assistant Mobility Plan.

There being no further business Mr. Montferrat asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion made by Mr. Cicalese and seconded by Ms. Jackson. All ayes. Meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Sandra Belan
Planning Board Secretary