

**Minutes of the Planning Board of the  
Township Of Hanover  
October 9, 2012**

Chairman called the Meeting to order at 7:02 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: Critchley, Deehan, DeNigris, Ferramosca, Francioli, Iannaccone, Nardone, Pinadella, and Steiger

Absent were Members: Byrne, and Williams

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.** 11-8-9  
**APPLICANT** Rocco & Donna Ignozza & Marty Keagan  
**OWNER** Rocco Ignozza  
**LOCATION:** 22 Handzel Road  
**BLOCK:** 8201 **LOTS:** 8 **ZONE:** R-40

Applicant sought of time to perfect the approved minor subdivision. Applicant proposed to subdivide the subject property into two lots for residential use and construction of two new houses on the subdivided lots. Applicant also sought "C" Variances. Minor Subdivision application was approved February 21, 2012, resolution was memorialized February 28, 2012. Extension Approved September 25, 2012

Moved by Member DeNigris, Seconded by Member Deehan  
Members Voting "AYE" DeNigris, Critchley, Iannaccone, Deehan, Nardone, Ferramosca, and Francioli

**II. JMF PROPERTIES REZONE REQUEST – Blais Brancheau – Township Planner**

Barry Mandelbaum - Attorney for JMF - Made an opening statement

- Gave history of the requested re-zone and the existing property
- Gave overview of the old Rowe Manufacturing site which is now Forrest Hill that Mr. Forgione was the developer and did the clean up
- Discussed the Renaissance at Hanover Site and the clean up
- Viera at Hanover on Horsehill Road and the cleanup
- The exact same issues exist at the Meat Packing site

Member Nardone - Board is offering the courtesy to see the new plan

- But only wants to hear what is different does not want to rehash what the board has already heard

Stanley Omland – Omland Engineering – Engineer for the applicant - Gave history of the proposed RM-5 and it was recommended by the board and the Township Committee said no after public opinion

- Wants to go through a list of questions and answers
- This is a townhome project not an apartment complex
- They will be owned not rented
- Reviewed a list of issues that were raised at a previous meeting by the board and the public
- 3 stories too high - 3 story in a 2 story project
- School children - less than 6 children will evolve from this project
- Single family would generate more
- Addressed traffic issues
- Jefferson Road is intended as a carrier road for traffic
- Home value issues addressed
- Addressed Child issues - this townhome project will generate less children than single family so the safety issues are reduced, there are no pools, swing sets or outdoor living
- Townhome living is largely indoors and this project will generate less noise than single family home
- Addressed the church
- Feels the town home use is a good transitional use will reduce the density from the original density proposed
- Addressed the zoning and the surrounding uses
- Referred to an aerial plan to address the surrounding areas
- Feels the Multi family is a good transitional use from the church to the town homes
- Does not feel single family homes by the church is a good use
- Continued to review the aerial and the surrounding areas
- The property in question is cleared - flat - contains wetlands - the site is a re-development site
- Original plan had 34 units,
- Plan 4.0 being presented this evening
- Same features from original plan
- Three story product on the church side and a two story project on the North side
- Plan will be buffered substantially
- Would provide fencing if required
- North West 15 three story units and 16 two story units,
- Showed a rendering of the 3 story plan - the three story plan and the two story plan will have the same look
- If complied with the R-40 zone would only get 3 lots
- In an R-10 they would only get 8 or 9 lots
- If they did Patio Homes they would only get 15 homes

- Impact to Community - the benefit is significant and positive
- Fees in the excess of \$750K, ongoing revenue to township would be \$100k
- The lot is 260 x 600

Member Pinadella - Discussed the Open Space Committee trying to get the Grant to buy what is now the Church Property

- Need to look at the intensity of the property being discussed tonight as a transition property
- Board needs to look at what makes sense as a transition area
- Feels this project makes sense as a transition area
- Does not see single family homes on this site

Member Steiger - Mount Laurel came in and the people are tired of the Townhouse and this is too much

- Mr. Steiger feels this is improper and does not want any part of this
- If this is not feasible to buy single family homes then don't buy the property and let someone else come in and buy it and develop it
- Go to another town and build Townhouse development it is not needed here

Member Iannaccone - The needs for today is Townhouses

- Most can't afford single family homes
- Many senior citizens are currently living in homes that are too large and look forward to going into a townhouse type development
- This is an integration of development

Member DeNigris - Questioned if the Our Lady of Mercy, Oakridge and single family homes is a transitional area

Member Pinadella - This was not thought of a transitional area

Member Francioli - Explained the Oakridge development and how it was to meet a COAH regulation

- Appreciates what he is hearing tonight
- Senses that an R-40 Zone in this town is passé
- But no comment on the change of the plans that was presented this evening

Member Nardone - Opened to the public

Jermey Noier - Slattery Lane - Main concern is the ratable

- The current property is an eyesore and that the ratable are needed for the town
- Everyone in town will have the benefits of the ratable

Mike Karlack - 23 Windemere - Does not feel the current property is that big of an eyesore

- It is an open piece of land with a few structures

Kamier Shake - 35 Windemere Court - Questioned what is changed

- Does not see the current site as an eyesore
- Concerned with Traffic
- Board should consider quality of life would be enhanced by single family and negatively impacted by high density housing

Joe Kozarelli - 5 Stealing Court - Hears a lot of emotional arguments

- But wants Data considered

Blais Brancheau – Township Planner - Found that all townhouses that were not age restricted market units

- 1 school child for every 9 units and 1 school child for every 5 affordable units,

Joe Kozarelli - 5 Stealing Court - Concerned with transient population

- Questioned price point of units

Stan Omland – Omland Engineering - The price point would be in the \$500k range

Member Ferramosca - The board is asking its self when enough Multi family is enough

Member Iannaccone - Due to Highlands - development areas have been reduced

Member Francioli - Explained the way the Master Plan review and the Planning Board work

Member Nardone – Posed to Member Ferramosca and Member Francioli

- Polled the public present for against and in favor of - the room was evenly divided

Member Francioli - Recommendation of Township Committee and the proposal before them sent back to Planning Board for reconsideration

- Township Committee was not in favor of a Townhouse unit

Member Ferramosca - Township Committee - There is a time and a place for anything

- Looked at the map
- In the middle of a residential zone
- If this were on the outskirts or the perimeter of this zone would be looked at differently
- Does not feel that the changes proposed tonight is enough

Member Pinadella - Suggested the Town buy the property for Open Space

Board - had an open discussion regarding the site

Member Iannaccone - Feels the Board should explore this further

Member Nardone - Feels a broader view of Jefferson Road should be looked at

Board - Continued to have an open discussion regarding the proposed project

Member Nardone - Asked board members what they think

Those in favor of a possible R-M Zone

Members DeNigris, Pinadella, Critchley, Iannaccone, Deehan, Nardone and Pinadella

Those for Single Family

Members Steiger and Ferramosca

Member Francioli is Neutral

Member Nardone - Choice could go back and support RM zone or could be in support of changing to single family use

In favor of Single family Zone

Members Steiger, Ferramosca, and Mayor

In favor of R-M zone but with Denist issues address

Members DeNigris, Pinadella, Critchley, Iannaccone, Deehan, and Nardone

Member Nardone and Board - Recommend to developer - This zoning as R-M is still the appropriate

- Still too dense and tall
- Would entertain some additional discussion at a later date with the suggested changes from the board
- December 11, 2012 - Developer will return with an amended concept plan

5 Minute Break

Back on record

### **III. DRAFT LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT – MACK-CALI/OB-RL2 ZONE – BLAIS BRANCHEAU**

- End result of tonight's meeting is to finalized document
- Either approve as drafted to go to public hearing or make amendments to go to public hearing

Reviewed the Land Use Plan Colored map

- Focusing on area between Route 10 and 287
- Described the current uses in the area - they are generalized not pure

Reviewed the proposed zoning map

- Map shows the OB-DS proposed zone

Reviewed pages 9, 10, 15, 17 - showing changes proposed to the Land Use Plans

- Language in red is showing uses that would be allowed in this zone

- Discussed key standards

Board - May want to look at smaller acreage for hotels - less than 10 acres

Member Pinadella - Wants motels stripped from the proposed zoning

- Would be fine with higher end hotels

Member Nardone – Board - Strip Motels from plan

- Higher end Hotel on a 5 acre site
- If it is with a convention center
- Higher acreage required

Blais Brancheau - Township Planner - Height reduced in this zone

- The public hearing will be in two weeks

#### **IV. TRAFFIC CAPACITY ANALYSIS REPORT – 67 WHIPPANY ROAD REDEVELOPMENT** Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer

- Traffic Capacity Analysis Report

Gordon Meth -RBA Group - Did an analysis for the 67 Whippany Road Site

- Took a comprehensive look at the whole area - Parsippany Road and Whippany Road
- Future development on 67 Whippany Road
- Current Road system just can't take it
- Possibility of mixed use developments on this site
- Both involved 420 apartments and an extended stay hotel
- Intersection of Whippany and Parsippany would need to be redesigned in order to make a four way intersection
- This requires condemnation of certain properties
- Discussed problem intersections throughout the town

Blais Brancheau – Township Planner - There are ongoing discussions with the dental and doctor office that would have to be condemned

Board - Blais Brancheau - Township Planner Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer and Gordon Meth – RBA Group - Open discussion regarding road - traffic improvements throughout the town

Board - Extending Algonquin would be the best way to get on and off of the 67 Whippany Road site

Blais Brancheau – Township Planner - Down zoning would be temporary fix - and once roads improved can up zone area again

#### **V. DRAFT CIRCULATION ELEMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN**

## Discussion

Member Steiger - Wants to see Malapardis - Ukraine Road reopened to Route 10

Blais Brancheau – Township Planner - Referred to the Street Classification map

- Described the classifications of the roadways
- Reviewed the next map
- Recommended Street Improvements Plan
- Reviewed the Sidewalk plan map

Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer - Main function of plan is to address areas of needed improvement

- Went through every intersection in town to look at - capacity – safety - access and pedestrian access
- Reviewed Route 10 and Ridgedale Avenue

Blais Brancheau – Township Planner - Discussed issued in relation to Algonquin Parkway extension

Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer - Green Acres required that Algonquin Parkway be removed from all maps

Board and Professionals - Discussed access from Malapardis Road - Ukraine Road to Route 10

Blais Brancheau – Township Planner - If study proves it warranted - the plan can be amended at a later date to address the access to Route 10 from Malapardis Road -Ukraine Road

- Not prepared to address this issue at this time

Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer – Route 10 and Algonquin Property

- Jug handle on Suburban Propane property still in plans
- Gave a quick brief overview of all of the proposed intersection recommendations
- Whippany and Hanover Avenue. Route 24 on ramp needs to be a two lane on ramp

Blais Brancheau - Township Planner and Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer - Will make suggested modifications to the plan and will be presented at the October 23rd public meeting

Member Nardone - October 16, 2012 Meeting Cancelled

Gerardo Maceira – Township Engineer - Will provide wetlands delineations to the board for their Route 10 study

Meeting Adjourned at 10:08 P.M.

---

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