

**Minutes of the Planning Board of the
Township Of Hanover
January 24, 2012**

Chairman J. William Byrne called the Meeting to order at 7:30 PM and The Open Public Meetings Act statement was read into the record:

Board Secretary, Kimberly Bongiorno took the Roll Call.

In attendance were Members: Byrne, Deehan, DeNigris, Ferramosca, Francioli, Nardone, Pinadella, Steiger, and Williams

Absent were Members: None

Also present were Board Attorney, Michael Sullivan and Township Engineer, Gerardo Maceira, PE. and Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

Cases Presented

I. RESOLUTIONS TO BE MEMORIALIZED

- 1) **CASE NO.** 04-2-4
APPLICANT/OWNER Woodmont Realty Group Cedar Knolls, LLC
LOCATION: 225 Cedar Knolls Road
BLOCK: 2302 **LOTS:** 2 **ZONE:** RM-4

Applicant sought approval to construct a multifamily housing community of 112 market units and up to 28 affordable housing units. Final site plan approval granted November 18, 2008 and resolution memorialized December 8, 2008. Applicant received the first extension for period of protection on January 25, 2011 and the resolution was memorialized on February 15, 2011 granting an extension of the period of protection from changes in the zoning regulations until December 9, 2011. Applicant was granted a second extension on January 17, 2012 until December 9, 2012

Moved by member Pinadella, Seconded by Member Francioli
Members Voting "AYE" DeNigris, Pinadella, Deehan, Williams, Nardone, Francioli and Byrne
Members Voting "NO" None

II. NEW BUSINESS

- 1) **CASE NO.** 11-6-3
APPLICANT MBI DEVELOPMENT
OWNER **Block 1702, Lot 12.02**
Hanover Ridgedale, LLC & Hanover Acquisition LLC
Block 1603, Lot 4

- Asked relief from the board not to have to pursue the footpath - much time and expense required to get the DEP wetlands permit - hoping board will not put the burden on the applicant to get this permit and require the footpath

Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer - sworn by the board attorney

- Item #2 - questioned the radio station site and their improvements

Brian Burns - The radio station must get their improvements out of the easement to this applicant's site.

Member Ferramosca - Understands the challenges of getting the footpath to Ridgedale - but asks the applicant pursue some kind of grant money to pursue getting the path to Ridgedale

Stan Omland – Omland Engineering - They will make their best efforts to pursue this but asks it not be a condition of approval

Opened and closed to public-

Brian Burns - Gave the board background regarding the need for the variance for signage - Addressed the issue of them sending out the incorrect time with their notice and having to wait until 8:00pm to begin the variance testimony

Break

Back on record

Stan Omland – Omland Engineering - Addressed the markings that fire chief Davidson requested on the building to identify the buildings with additional signage

- This is a health and safety issue - and is asking for variance to comply with the fire chief's request

Opened to the public and closed to public

Michael Sullivan- Board Attorney - Summarized the conditions

Motion to approve amended preliminary and final site plan and sign variance with conditions

Moved by member Steiger, Seconded by member DeNigris

Members Voting "AYE" DeNigris, Pinadella, Steiger, Deehan, Williams, Nardone, Ferramosca, Francioli and Byrne

Members Voting "NO" None

2)	CASE NO.	11-9-11
	APPLICANT	SUN EDISON LLC
	OWNER	AT&T

LOCATION: 80 HORSEHILL ROAD
BLOCK: 701 **LOT:** 4 **ZONE:** I-B3

Applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final site plan approval as well as tree removal permits for proposed solar field to support existing facility

Case carried to February 21, 2012 at 7:30pm letter read into record by Board Secretary

Moved by Member Ferramosca, Seconded by Member Steiger
All present in favor

- 3) **CASE NO.** 11-12-13
APPLICANT 67 WHIPPANY ROAD INVESTORS LLC
OWNER MULTIPLE LOTS WITH MULTIPLE OWNERS
LOCATION: 67 & 85 WHIPPANY ROAD
BLOCK: 5801 **LOTS:** 1, 1.01 **ZONE:** OB-RL3, I-5

Applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan, minor subdivision and variance approval for the development of a New Corporate Office Complex.

Board Action Date – COMPLETENESS NOT DETERMINED AT THIS TIME

Member Ferramosca - recused himself from this application

Tom Malman - Attorney for the applicant - Gave a brief overview of the application

Sam Moreal - sworn by Board attorney - Thanked the professionals for their time and effort in reviewing this application.

- Feels that they have all worked to make this a clean application - please respect that they are under corporate confidentiality as to who the tenant at this property will be

Opened to the public

Closed to public

Grayson Murray - Engineer - Partner at Bohler Engineering - Gave overview of his education and professional background – Sworn by Board Attorney - accepted by the Board

Exhibit A-1 - Aerial exhibit 200 scale sheet 1 of 1 dated 1-24-12

Exhibit A-2 - Site plan exhibit rendering plan dated 1-24-12

Exhibit A-3 - Site plan exhibit phase II rendering

Grayson Murray - Engineer - Gave overview of the site and the surrounding area

- Discussed the access to the site and the driveways
- South area of the site contains 3,900 parking stalls, existing buildings
- Currently there is ongoing remediation ongoing by Lucent
- Buildings on site - most will be demolished - Building 100 will remain - Building 200 will remain - and Building 12 will remain and undergo significant upgrades

- Referred to Exhibit A-3 to discuss the proposed conditions - Preliminary and final site plan and minor sub-division
 - Both lots will function as one
 - The focus of this application is the Northern tract
 - Lot 1.04 - does not meet frontage - relief can be granted if frontage is not required
- Phase I
- Building 100 - existing is 3 story structure will become a 5 story structure
 - Building 200 is 5 story structure building will be connected by a single story atrium
 - Total area of buildings will be 683,130 square feet
 - Building 12 will be a fitness and wellness center for the employees
 - Discussed access and parking
 - Provided circulation for passenger vehicles as well as tractor trailers
 - Parking distribution - Tried to provide good distribution around the building areas
 - Will provide enhanced pedestrian access from the parking field to the west
 - Discussed signage
 - Addressed storm water management and DEP permits
 - Discussed security gates - secure fencing around site - secure access points
 - Utilities and infrastructure will be brought up to modern standards - lighting fixtures will also be brought up to modern safety standards
 - Landscaping - 3,000 new plantings are proposed - and provided the breakdown of the type of plantings that will be provided
 - Phase I- referred to Exhibit A-2 to describe Phase I

Member Nardone – Questioned timeline between Phase I and Phase II

Tom Malman- There is not a specific timeline at this time

Grayson Murray - 2,504 parking stalls provided for Phase I - the full parking will be built

- No parking will be banked at this time

Tom Malman - Addressed the engineers report dated 1-24-12

Grayson Murray - Addressed the generators, noise, they will comply with the code

Addressed Township Planners - Blais Brancheau's report date 1-24-12

- Will revise the detail to meet the parking striping detail
- They will comply with the balance of the planners report
- Discussed the patio areas - they may or may not be built - asking for the Board to understand that these areas may or may not be built it has not been determined at this time

Member Pinadella - Questioned the location of the walking trails, the flag poles, the visitors center

Grayson Murray - The visitor's center is a proposed building and they will provide the details to Mr. Brancheau

Member Pinadella - Questioned the cooling towers

- Difference between a wetland and an exceptional wetland
- Questioned how drainage will be controlled from the North of the site
- Questioned the lighting and the height and wattage

Blais Brancheau – Township Planner - Questioned optional improvements

Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer – questioned remediation of Lot 1.04 and this delaying the proposed improvements

Opened to the public

Blais Brancheau - Township Planner and Gerardo Maceira- Township Engineer - sworn by board attorney

Christian Peter - 9 Whippany Road - Questioned drainage along north side of the property

- Questioned time frame on the remediation

George Schmidt - 57 Whippany Road

Questioned drainage and grading as it effects the properties on Whippany Road

Dr. Garcia - owner 53 Whippany Road - Has questions on traffic - will wait until traffic engineer testifies

James Heller-1468 West 9th Street – Cleveland, Ohio - Architect for the applicant

- Accepted by the board

Exhibit A-4 - Photos of existing site conditions

Exhibit A-5 - South elevation of building 100

Exhibit A-6 - SK-6 showing view of building 100 showing the five story atrium

Exhibit A-7 - SK-7 south of building 100

Exhibit A-8 - SK-8 Building 200

Exhibit A-9 - SK-9 south side of building 300 and connector line

Exhibit A-10 - Existing conditions of building 12

Exhibit A-11- SK-11 floor plan of building 12

Exhibit A-12 - SK-12 Perspective view of Building 12

- Described the architecture that is existing and proposed for the buildings
- Described the atrium and the signage, the facade and stair towers
- Described the modifications of the existing buildings
- Described the proposed wellness and fitness area - showed the old building and described the layout of the proposed building
- Wellness facility is strictly for the staff use - there will be no outside members of the fitness center

Opened to the public

Closed to public

Erik Keller – Omland Engineering – Traffic Engineer - sworn by board attorney - accepted by board

- Referred to traffic report revised through 1-13-12
- Gave overview of the traffic history of the site
- Discussed the driveway access to the site
- Discussed how the traffic is under the no built scenario and the built scenario
- Traffic generated at this site can be accommodated by the surrounding streets
- The traffic signal at the main driveway will be reinstalled to manage the traffic
- They will deal with county on the installation of the signal because it is a county road
- There will be police traffic control until the traffic signal is re-installed
- Discussed the operation of the North driveway - this is proposed to be an un-signalized driveway
- The proposed development of the north campus can be accommodated by the existing roadway structure in the adjacent area of the site and can operate safely

Member Byrne-concerned with the impact on Whippany Road and questioned the magnitude of the impact - most concerned with the evening rush

Eric Keller - PM peak hour between 5pm - 6pm - discussed current numbers of 2,600 cars currently and proposed 3,100 cars in a no built condition

- Discussed the traffic and how the counts were calculated

Member Francioli - Questioned what the counts were when Alcatel lucent occupied the site

Eric Keller - Police officer controlled will be around the hours of 7:30-8:30 AM and 5:00-6:00 PM - This will be monitored and adjusted as needed

- Does not believe the North driveway will need police access control

Sam Moreal - The south campus is not part of this application - the driveway that accesses Eden Lane - there will be a real-estate owners association between the north and south campus

- The Eden Lane access will still exist and be used

Opened to the public

Christian Peter - 9 Whippany Road - Questioned an officer at the North Driveway

Eric Keller - Addressed Mr. Peters concerns regarding the impact to his driveway from the North Driveway

Dr. Garcia - 53 Whippany Road - Concerned how this development will affect the access to and from his site for his patients

Eric Keller – The applicant will comply with what the county requires, having controlled movement will help access to the surrounding sites

Closed to the public-

Tom Malman - referred to Township Engineers - Gerardo Maceira's report dated 1-24-12 Item #3 - they hope to work with the board, the township and the county regarding traffic operations and measures

- Concerned with the language in Mr. Maceira's report -- will work with the county and the township to address these issues

Opened to the public for comment-

Christian Peter – sworn by board attorney - feels project is a wonderful project, may create traffic problems but it is a needed project

Paul Sammon - Questioned Mr. Murray regarding flow from the site

Closed to public

Tom Malman - Gave brief summation

- Requesting 5 year protection of approval

Member Francioli - Addressed some of the access and traffic concerns

Michael Sullivan - Summarized motion and conditions

Motion to approve Moved by Member Steiger-to approve Preliminary and Final site plan for Phase 1 & 2, variance relief, Extension of protection of Development approvals until January 24, 2017, minor sub-division and board conditions, as well as relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-35 & 36.

Seconded by Mayor Francioli

Members Voting “AYE” DeNigris, Pinadella, Steiger, Deehan, Williams, Nardone, Francioli, and Byrne

Members Voting “NO” None

Meeting Adjourned at 10:02 P.M.

KIMBERLY A. BONGIORNO, LUA.
BOARD SECRETARY
PLANNING BOARD
TOWNSHIP OF HANOVER
COUNTY OF MORRIS
STATE OF NEW JERSEY