

**Minutes of the Planning Board of the
Township Of Hanover
December 11, 2012**

Vice Chairman Robert Nardone called the Meeting to order at 7:05 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, DeNigris, Ferramosca, Francioli, Iannaccone, Nardone, Steiger and Williams

Absent were Members: Byrne, Deehan, and Pinadella,

Also present were Township Engineer, Gerardo Maceira, PE. and Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

Cases Presented

I. PUBLIC HEARING ON AMENDMENT TO LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN – ADDING I-B3 AND A-H1 ZONE DISTRICTS AND DELETING O-1 ZONE DISTRICT

Blais Brancheau - Reviewed the Public hearing on Amendment to Land Use Element of the Master Plan

- Adding I-B3 and A-H1 zone districts and deleting O-1 Zone district
- This is the Master plan catching up with the existing ordinance
- Described changes within the ordinance
- Insuring a minimum floor area
- Amending Master Plan to be consistent with the ordinance

Opened and closed to public

Motion to adopt master plan amendment

Moved by Member Ferramosca, Seconded by Member Iannaccone

Members Voting “AYE” DeNigris, Steiger, Critchley, Iannaccone, Williams, Nardone, Ferramosca, and Francioli

Members Voting “NO” None

II. REFERRAL OF ORDINANCES FROM THE TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE

Blais Brancheau – Township Planner - Reviewed all ordinances

23-2012 – OB-DS ZONE

Motion to recommend Adoption of ordinance 23-2012

Moved by Member Iannaccone, Seconded by Member DeNigris
Members Voting "AYE" DeNigris, Steiger, Critchley, Iannaccone, Williams, Nardone,
Ferramosca, and Francioli
Members Voting "NO" None

24-2012 – DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SOLAR ENERGY FACILITIES

Motion to recommend Adoption of ordinance 24-2012

Moved by Member Iannaccone, Seconded by Member Critchley
Members Voting "AYE" DeNigris, Steiger, Critchley, Iannaccone, Williams, Nardone,
Ferramosca, and Francioli
Members Voting "NO" None

27-2012 – AMENDING REGULATIONS FOR THE I-B3 ZONE

Motion to recommend Adoption of ordinance 27-2012

Moved by Member Iannaccone, Seconded by Member Steiger
Members Voting "AYE" DeNigris, Steiger, Critchley, Iannaccone, Williams, Nardone,
Ferramosca, and Francioli
Members Voting "NO" None

III. RESOLUTIONS TO BE MEMORIALIZED:

- 1) **CASE NO.** 12-9-8
APPLICANT Consolidated Bearing Company
OWNER Tara Investors, LLC
LOCATION: 10 Wing Drive Cedar Knolls
BLOCK: 1101 **LOTS:** 6 **ZONE:** IP
Applicant sought permission to construct a backup generator system in the rear area of the property. The installation will be fully compliant with all Township Zoning and State noise control regulations. Application approved November 20, 2012

Motion to approve

Moved by Member DeNigris, Seconded by Member Francioli
Members Voting "AYE" DeNigris, Steiger, Critchley, Iannaccone, Ferramosca,
Francioli, and Nardone
Members Voting "NO" None

- 2) **CASE NO.** 12-9-9
APPLICANT GE Aviation Systems, LLC
OWNER The GC Net Lease (Whippany) Investors, LLC
LOCATION: 110 Algonquin Parkway (aka 30 Melanie Lane)
Whippany

BLOCK: 6601 LOTS: 11 ZONE: I

Applicant sought permission to install a stand-by generator with a double walled diesel tank on a concrete pad. Applicant sought relief from section 166-195H (1). Application November 20, 2012

Motion to approve

Moved by Member Ferramosca, Seconded by Member Iannaccone
Members Voting "AYE" DeNigris, Steiger, Critchley, Iannaccone, Ferramosca,
Francioli, and Nardone
Members Voting "NO" None

IV. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL – NOVEMBER 20, 2012

Motion to approve

Moved by Member Critchley, Seconded by Member Ferramosca
Voice Vote All present in favor

V. COURTESY REVIEW - SOLAR POWER CONCEPT FOR THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING PROJECT – WANZEK CONSTRUCTION

Michael Beck - Attorney - Joint Initiative Morris County Improvement Authority

- Whole project financed by bonds
- County arranged program to be zero cost to county and townships

Mr. Ronald Igneri - Innovative Engineering, Inc. - Licensed professional engineer

- Prepared plans before board this evening
- Reviewed the plans that were submitted to the board describing the project
- Solar array system will satisfy 25% of energy needs
- Ground mounted system
- Panels on a racking system
- Solar arrays face south at 25 degrees
- There will be an 8 foot high black vinyl fence surrounding the compound with a 16 foot wide gate
- This is a net metered project
- Electric generated by this panels will be solely used by the municipal complex
- Will be fully compliant with Department of Environmental Protection and Town noise ordinances
- Addressed the landscaping proposed for this project
- 14 trees to be removed
- Proposing 24 replacement plantings - lower growth species
- Meadow grass is planted under the panels and maintained once or twice a year - special grass meant for these types of installations
- Maintained by the solar arrays
- Still waiting for Department of Transportation approval to remove trees

Member Nardone - This is a courtesy review and the board does not have any problems with this project

Diana Plata - Question from the public is there any cost to township - Mr. Beck explained how the funding for the project works

Courtesy review only Board okay with presentation

VI. COURTESY REVIEW - WHIPPANY PARK HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETIC & PHYSICAL EDUCATION FACILITY REFURBISHMENT.

Carol Grossi - Hanover Park and Whippany Park Administrator - Review of Whippany Park High School athletic and physical education facility refurbishment

- Main highlight is synthetic turf field for Football field hockey girls and boys lacrosse and boys and girls soccer

Michael Bieri - Walked board through scope of work for the girls' softball field - the baseball fields - resurfacing the tennis court - Junior Varsity softball as well as freshman field hockey field

- Re-grade the practice field so that it can be used for multiple sports
 - Expanding parking lot by two rows to add approximately 44 spaces
 - Described the stadium expansion
 - Track will be replaced and inside field will be replaced with artificial turf
- Field House - existing field house would be removed - new would have unisex and flexible locker rooms - concession area - single story building with a pitched roof - will be a masonry structure matching existing school
- \$8.9 million bond issue Whippany only
 - Addressed the lighting and the spillage – both side of stadium shielded max 0.1 at property line (not lit currently) – Basically during fall season – Dimmable

Carol Grossi – Hanover Park and Whippany Park Administrator - Addressed when the lights will be used - Fields will strictly be used by Hanover Township

- Planning on March 12, 2013 referendum
- Looking for competition in 2014

Courtesy review only – Board is fine with how presented

VII. 67 WHIPPANY ROAD SOUTH CAMPUS – SAM MORREALE

Tom Malman - Day Pitney - Attorney for 67 Whippany - Discussing development of the South Campus

Joe Burgis – Burgis Associates, Inc. -Township Special Planner
Option One - Addressed the multi-family residential suggested

- Extended stay hotel
- 500k square feet of office space
- Existing road structure could not handle the office development that is currently allowed on the South Campus
- 450 dwelling units proposed for the bulk of the development one and two bedroom as well as affordable units

Option Two - A number of the components are the same

- In the place of the 500 square foot office space would be a mixed use retail restaurant and residential uses
- At this time does not feel an overlay development has merit and does not approve of it - feels it should be a mixed use development
- Addressed concerns with the access to the site and some buffer issues
- Concerns with the size of the executive suites hotel - over 400sk foot hotel
- Concerns with design issues with the size and scale of the retail site
- 150k square feet seems oversized
- Discussed issues with affordable housing - COAH has provided for a 20% set aside
- Demographic analysis - significant area of concern is the number of children in the development
- 110-120 children on this site
- Approximately 77 school age children
- Approximately 63 would end up in the public school system
- Once they have requested information from the Board of Education will be able to address the impact on the school system better
- The overall fiscal concept is positive
- Recreation impacts
- Sees a number of positive elements but has significant reservations about the magnitude of the projects proposed
- Density is an issue

Board and Mr. Burgis - Had an open discussion regarding the proposed development and its impacts on the community

Member Francioli - Very disappointed in this plan - all he sees is density - gave reasons for disappointment with the proposed project

- Disappointed to see what they rejected some time ago

Member Ferramosca - Expressed his concerns with this project and the impacts on Township Services

Thomas Malman – Day Pitney – Attorney - Requested a possible sub-committee with Township Professionals to work together to reach a common goal

Mr. Minno - Architect for applicant - Need to find the right density that matches the projected plan

- Overall benefit of mixed use notion
- Keep people on the site rather than sending them out on to the main roads

Member Nardone - Feels like the proposed development is to much - recommendation - need to come back with a better plan and something much less dense

- Do not want an overlay
- Wants to rezone it so there is control over what is developed on the site

Joe Burgis – Burgis Associates, Inc. -Township Special Planner - Suggested his office work directly with Mr. Minno’ s office to come up with an agreeable plan development

Sam Morealle - Property owner - 67 Whippany Investors - They are listening - acquired this site 2 years ago - concept of putting a sub-committee together is an excellent idea and would like to work together

The board took a short break and then continued on the record

VIII. JMF PROPERTIES REZONE REQUEST – JOE FORGIONE

Stan Omland – Omland Engineering - Engineer for applicant - Gave brief history of past concepts that had been proposed for this site.

- Here this evening depicting single family residence
- Reduced density
- 24 patio homes/reduced colonies 32 foot wide 46 foot long
- Proposed in a condominium form of ownership
- No outside sheds – pools - swing sets
- These homes would be 2,200 to 2,400 square feet with 2 car garage
- 10 to 12 foot building to building setback
- Single family home but with all of the benefits of condo maintenance
- Addressed school impact – traffic - ratable - child safety - noise impacts

Opened to the board for discussion

Stan Omland – Omland Engineering – Engineer - Windemere is 20 feet building to building

- Proposed project is 10 foot building to building setback
- Restricted from modifying the building
- Zero lot line theme
- There are no COAH units proposed in this project
- Will work with Planning Board and Township Committee on how to address COAH units

Joseph Forgione - Will be the developer - Swears under oath he will be the developer of this project and that he will not sell them off to be developed

Stan Omland – Omland Engineering – Engineer - Discussed rear yard setbacks

- Not sure if these homes will have decks
- Will work with Board on that issue
- Hammerhead turn around at the end of the street proposed rather than a cul-da-sac
- Proposed street is 28 foot wide
- Private road plowed by the associations contractor
- Addressed how a fire truck would navigate the project
- Up to 18 visitor spots with on street parking

- Addressed driveway and vehicle length and overhang over the sidewalks and the roadway from driveways

Member Nardone - Would like to see some geometry changes to the home layout so that the homes are setback further and there is less overhang of vehicles out of the driveways

- Questioned the board regarding their feelings regarding hammer head or cul-de-sac at the end of the street

Member Ferramosca - Would like to see a cul-de-sac - would like to see proper off street on on street visitor parking

Member DeNigris - Feels project is too dense - Would like to have more side yard width

- Need to work something with the side yards and different layouts

Member Critchley - Would like to see side yards similar to Windemere and then that would be a project he could consider

Mayor Francioli - The density is still an issue

Member Nardone - Summarized - Fewer homes but done in a way to increase side to side and setback and a desire to see a cul-de-sac

Member Ferramosca - 40 foot rear yard and 15 foot side yard building to building
Applicant to return on January 8, 2013

Pastor gave a heated protest to the project

Stan Omland – Omland Engineering – Engineer - Addressed the pastors comments

Member Nardone - Allowed the meeting to be opened to the public

Dennis Laloya - 27 Windemere Court - Concerned with fire trucks and tractor trailer having to back out onto Jefferson is of concern

Kelly Coe - 14 Windemere Court - Feels houses are way too close for comfort

Angelo Sarno - 28 Windermere Court - Was told that a cluster development would never be allowed again in Hanover Township and he feels this is worse than a cluster development

Andy Milhalko - Would like to see a true single family home development

Joe Mihalko - Anna Terrace – Town Developer and community need to negotiate and come to an agreement for how this property will be developed

Brian Raphard - 8 Windermere Court - Asked for consideration of how this will impact the neighborhood

Diana - Briarwood Court

Joe Shapinsky rejects the idea of a transition zone this is an R-40 single family zone and should be looked at as that

Member Nardone - Addressed the changing needs and 1 acre lots with million dollar homes are not what is being sought now

Board directed Mr. Forgione to revise and return to the Board on January 8, 2013

Meeting Adjourned at 10:12 P.M.

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