

MINUTES

PLANNING BOARD

MAY 22, 2012

LONG HILL TOWNSHIP

CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The Chairman, Mr. Connor, called the meeting to order at 8:04 P.M. He then read the following statement:
Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting a copy of the public meeting dates on the municipal bulletin board, by sending a copy to the Courier News and Echoes Sentinel and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk, all in January, 2012.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

On a call of the roll, the following were present:

Christopher Connor, Chairman	Sandi Raimer, 1 st Alt.	<u>Excused:</u>
Charles Arentowicz, Member		Brendan Rae, Member
Jerry Aroneo, Mayor’s Designee		
Donald Butterworth, Member	Kevin O’Brien, Twp. Planner	Barry Hoffman, Bd. Attorney
Joseph Cilino, Member	Thomas Lemanowicz, Bd. Engineer	
Guy Roshto, Member	Dawn Wolfe, Planning & Zoning Administrator	
Michael Smargiassi, Member		

X X X X X X X X X X X

EXECUTIVE SESSION - It was determined that there was no need to hold an executive session.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of February 14, 2012 were approved as written on motion by Mr. Aroneo and seconded by Mr. Cilino. Mr. Butterworth, Mrs. Raimer and Mr. Smargiassi abstained as they were not present at that meeting.

PUBLIC QUESTION OR COMMENT PERIOD

The meeting was opened to the public for questions or comments. There being none, the meeting was closed to the public.

DISCUSSION (CONT’D)

OFF SITE SIGNAGE ORDINANCE – REVIEW PROPOSED ORDINANCE LANGUAGE

Mr. O’Brien said that the Planning Board reviewed the Off Site Signage Ordinance 2 weeks ago, at which time public comments were received. He said that the Board received a draft Ordinance that has been revised by Mr. Pidgeon and himself and the Board had a discussion about that revised Ordinance 2 weeks ago and, although there was no decision, generally the discussion was whether or not this was something that this Board wanted to do. He said that he and Mrs. Wolfe went through their files and brought out some examples of signage that previous Boards have looked at which were provided to the Board this evening. Mr. Sandow also prepared a memo to the Board in response to some of the questions that were raised at the last meeting. He said that it is up to the Board to decide which direction it would like to go in.

Mrs. Raimer referred to where it talks about the distance that a business must be from a main road before it can be permitted to have a sign. She asked why we even need to describe the length of space between the street intersection and the main road noting that there could be something that slightly exceeds the 3/10 of a mile that has been proposed and she would hate for them to have to go through the trouble of a variance in order to get that sign posted. Her thinking was to change the wording to “Each retail restaurant, professional, recreational, or consumer oriented service business in the B-1-5, B-1-20, etc. zones”.

Mr. O’Brien explained that the restriction originally came from the Promotion & Enhancement Committee (PEC) which came into the Board with a list of what they thought would be eligible targeted businesses that would be able to use these signs and they came up with the 0.3 mile restriction because the businesses that they targeted that were off the main road were no more than 0.3 mile. The Board weighed in on it and stayed with the 0.3 mile because they did not want something a very long distance away from an intersection to be identifiable. He said it is up to the Board whether they wanted to change it or not.

Mrs. Raimer thought the goal was to be able to recognize those businesses that didn’t have frontage on a main street.

Mr. O’Brien replied that the PEC identified what they thought were the possible users of that type of sign and found that all of those businesses that they identified were within 0.3 mile. In response to Mrs. Raimer, he said that, according to the PEC, it covers all businesses that could possibly be proposed that don’t currently exist now and noted that one of their representatives is present.

Mr. Dennis Sandow, member of the PEC, said that the 0.3 mile was based on the longest possible user which is Lombardo Farms on Morristown Rd. He said that it happens that they are protected by a separate section (155.3j) which allows farm stand signs with no limit. The 0.3 mile would encompass them if you wanted to bring them into this standard fold rather than continuing Sec. 155.3j. He got that sense that Mrs. Raimer was asking about the very precise language about from curb to corner of the building.

Mrs. Raimer replied that it goes beyond that and it was her understanding of the goal that we should be able to afford those businesses that didn't have frontage on a main street to have some form of recognition on a main street that we drive through, in which case, she didn't know if we were being too restrictive by saying within 0.3 mile, regardless of how it is measured.

Given the boundaries of the business, office, and industrial zones, Mr. Sandow said that those zones do not extend more than 0.3 miles from the main streets and so it is somewhat self limiting. He said that clearly we do not want to extend this to home businesses operating permissibly in a residential zone, so the business has to be located within a business zone and business zones are all within 0.3 mile of the named streets. In the course of putting together his handout, he said that he discovered one exception and that is the Red Oak Farm which is at the north end of Pleasant Plains Rd. right up against White Bridge Rd. It is a business operating in the Conservation Zone and is a place that would qualify otherwise except that it is about 1 ½ miles from Long Hill Rd. He said that the reason that they included the 0.3 mile in the first place is because they didn't want long distance signs such as signs at the Berkeley Heights border pointing to the Millington Savings Bank. He said that the whole mileage issue is "sort of a conundrum" and perhaps it should be resolved by taking out all reference to distance and just let the ministerial process of Engineer, DPW Superintendent, and the PEC pass judgment as to whether or not any sign is inappropriate.

Mr. Smargiassi said that, the way it is drafted now, if they were in a Conservation Zone they wouldn't be allowed to have a sign regardless.

Mr. O'Brien agreed.

Mr. Smargiassi felt that this has "ballooned beyond". When he first heard about it, he thought it was to be focused on the business districts (or what we think of as the business centers or districts within the Township) and to help with some of those businesses that may be off a couple of dead end streets and he felt that it seems to have gone beyond that.

Mr. Sandow said that on his list he listed a lot of these as "futures" because they are legally permissible but there is nobody on those streets now. For example, at the end of the intersection of Main Ave. and Mercer St. you have got the Recorder Publisher, but they don't have a walk-in business so in and of itself they wouldn't qualify for a sign at that intersection but if someone else were to buy the property and create a walk-in business there, then that intersection would qualify for a sign in the future. He said that it is the same at the intersection with Essex St. noting that Sarco has ceased operating a retail firearms business right now and nobody else on that street has a retail walk-in business. He said that that is why the list is up to 9 intersections. He said that it is up to the business owner whether he actually wants to spend the money for a sign and have it installed, so this will be limited by desire. He said that one of the things we talked about, but beyond the scope of this Board's approval, is that we would put up symmetric signs pointing to Township facilities (which currently aren't signed), so he set out to catalog the Township facilities that might qualify for signs comparable to these in order to have a consistent look and feel and that turned out to be a longer list than the commercial signs. He said that the Township Committee would decide whether or not they want to preserve the "hodge-podge" of no signage and small signs that exist for the Township enterprises, but if we were to put them all into the same format, that list would be longer. He thought that 14 intersections would qualify for Township sponsored signs and 8 or 9 would qualify for business sponsored signs.

Mr. Aroneo felt that the signs Mr. Sandow was speaking about for Riverside Park and the Little League Field are really to help people coming from out of town and evolved out of necessity over time. He did not see a need for a Stirling Lake sign since residents go to the lake and we do not attract people from out of town to the Lake.

Mr. Sandow replied that that would be a policy definition by the Committee. Referring to his handout dated 5/18/12, at the bottom of Pg. 3, he said that the Little League sign is way too high and the lettering is way too small to be readable. He said that, if the out of town teams are truly trying to get here to play a game, that sign is not so easy to find. He said that, two meetings ago, Mrs. Raimer had requested a survey of other towns. He did not get up to Chester, but went through So. Bound Brook again and used them as a "poster case". Referring to his handout dated 7/14/10, he said that you will notice that the lettering on those signs is only 2" tall instead of 4" and locating a very skinny arrow inside a circle makes it almost impossible to tell which way the arrow is pointing unless you get up very close and squint. On Pg. 4 of 7, he said that the bottom of the sign points to a liquor store that the sign is immediately in front of and the other items are all within a span of a couple of light posts from that sign and then there is another sign. He said that that is certainly something that we don't want to do.

Mr. O'Brien said that one of the differences is that So. Bound Brook identifies all of the businesses in the business zone rather than those that are off the beaten path.

Mr. Sandow noted that about 1/3 of the sign arms are empty, which suggested to him that some businesses moved out and they took down the whole sign. He said that this is not a good idea but is the only one he had been able to find so far. He felt that our solution works for our particular situation where we have a very small number of businesses in the business zone, but off the main street.

In response to Mr. Connor, Mr. Sandow said that the PEC thinks that Township signs such as Stirling Lake or the Hicks Tract would compliment the business signs but that is a decision for the Township Committee because they would be outside the scope of the Land Use Ordinance. He said that the PEC has recommended that they be identical in construction with a different colored background to differentiate them from commercial signs (brown

versus blue), but aside from that attempt to get a little uniformity instead of the “hodge-podge” that we now have. He said that one of the original purposes of the PEC was to achieve some level of beautification in town by removing and reducing the big wide collection of different existing signage. He referred to the top of Pg. 4 (right hand photo) of his 5/18/12 handout and asked if anyone had ever stopped to read that “little bitty sign” under the left hand turn sign and suspected no one has.

Mr. Arentowicz said that he read it on the way to Town Hall tonight and it says they are soliciting for volunteer firemen and includes an 800 number.

Mr. Sandow said that, if you call the number posted, you get an answering machine which does not identify itself. He assumed that it is in Trenton somewhere because 1-800-fireline is a nationwide number with state subdivisions. The recording asks that you leave you name and number and someone will call you back. He said that this is the only sign of its kind that he has seen in town and assumed that someone did a mass mailing of signs many years ago and we just stuck it somewhere. He doubted that it has helped and that we ever recruited a fireman by calling a machine in Trenton from a little bitty sign at an intersection. He referred to the middle of Pg. 5 at the Meyersville Circle and said he circled the “No Littering” sign. He questioned, when you are trying to navigate your way around the circle, who is going to notice a “No Littering” sign?

Mr. Arentowicz said that he drove on Valley Rd. at the entrance to the Township up by River Rd. and within 100’ or less there were 14 signs. There were so many, he could not remember what they were for and they were all inconsistent and there were no business signs for the businesses in our Township. Proceeding down Valley Rd. to Poplar Dr., he said that there are at least 8 signs that you can’t read. They are white and the print has worn off and most are “No Parking/No Standing” (which he assumed are County signs). On Poplar Dr. by the Shop-Rite, he said that there are at least 2 you can’t read and he thought they were also “No Parking/No Standing”. When you look at all the sign posts, he said that they are rusted, not maintained, and look horrible. He said that, in his development, the sign posts for the two stop signs (as you come out onto Valley Rd.) are rusted and look horrible. He said that he, personally, painted some of the other sign posts in his neighborhood. He said that some of the signs in Mr. Sandow’s photos and the ones that he saw are under County, State, or Federal Government control. He had a major problem with all of the inconsistency with the signs in the Township, however he said that at least the present proposal would span a potential of 14 signs and they would be of a consistent nature and readability. He said that we have a provision to get rid of them if they are not maintained and they are to promote business in the Township. He said he could assure that the 14 signs that he saw weren’t promoting any of the businesses in the Township and they were of an inconsistent nature. To support the businesses, the PEC, and Mr. Sandow’s work, he said that he was in favor of the 14 signs because they will promote the businesses off the main streets, will be of a consistent nature, and will be maintained according to proposed Ordinance.

Mr. Cilino was in agreement with Mr. Arentowicz to the extent that we have consistency. He had not heard anything about making changes to consistency and asked if we are going to require changes to the signs to bring it more in line to what Mr. Sandow has indicated in other areas, or if we are going to leave the “mish-mosh” of signs all over the place.

Mr. Connor replied that the Board can recommend to the Township Committee that the signs under its control be made consistent with our sign language. He was not sure what could be done with the County, State or Federal signs.

Referring to Poplar Dr., Mr. Cilino said that he visited the area near the Shop-Rite to get a general feel of the signage clutter at the two corners and, even though there is only one sign in front of Shop-Rite, he said that it looks horrible. He said that, if we move in a direction to have consolidation, then he was in favor of putting those other 14 businesses on board. If we don’t, he was opposed to it.

Mr. Connor said that, assuming that the Board will adopt the recommendations and forward them to the Township Committee for action, we could certainly add a recommendation that those signs which are under the Township Committee’s control be made consistent with the standards and if the Township Committee has a slightly different view of what the sign should look like, they will come back with an ordinance which would be consistent with the way they want signs. As long as it didn’t do direct damage to ours, he said that the Board would probably be agreeable to those changes.

Mr. Cilino asked if there was anyone who could speak to the County to explain our project and perhaps with an explanation they would be sensitive to helping us move in the direction we are looking at.

Mr. Connor replied that he was sure that the County government has adopted sign ordinances, however, he was not sure how we fit under them.

Mr. O’Brien said that the only County signs are the directional signs (the green ones) that the County has erected. He said that they are standard highway signs and the “No Parking/No Standing” signs are actually municipal signs.

Mr. Lemanowicz agreed and said that they are enforced by the municipality.

In response to Mr. Arentowicz, Mr. O’Brien said that the 8 “white” signs he had referred to earlier are the Township’s responsibility. He did not think that we have to worry about the signs that the County has put up.

Referring to Pg. 3 of Mr. Sandow's 5/18/12 handout where it shows the "Worst case" at the intersection of Long Hill Rd. & Division Ave., he said that it looked like somebody just threw a bunch of darts into the ground.

Mr. O'Brien replied that the Rt. 287 sign was probably installed by the County D.O.T.

Mr. Sandow said that the bike route sign is pretty much required because the Millington Station is the beginning of the bike trail between there and the Stirling Station and so this is the first sign of the route and there isn't anywhere else put it. It is a local sign and he was sure that it was paid for as part of the grant that we received from the State to build the bike trail through the Hicks Tract. He said that the yellow sign indicating 20 mph. with a curved arrow is tells you to slow down when you go around the curve at the fire house. It is a block away from the fire house because there is no grass between the intersection and the other side of The Crescent and that every single inch of curb and sidewalk all the way past the fire house is paved. He said that the Rt. 287 sign is there so that people who are taking the short cut off of Rt. 78 up to Maple Ave. don't get lost when they come up River Rd. onto Division Ave. and have to make the right turn to get up to Maple Ave. He felt that is a sign we could probably do without. He did not recall if there is a corresponding sign on the other side of the street pointing southbound traffic down to Rt. 78, but felt that there certainly should be a pair of these signs at River Rd. He said that, coming west on Long Hill Rd. there is a sign pointing south and there are also all of the N.J. Transit signs pointing to the various stations and they are there to help their weekend bus drivers when they have alternate service and hire a bus company to make all the stops. He said that those signs are at every major intersection on Long Hill Rd.

Mr. Connor felt that we should at least take care of the signs that we have responsibility for and see what can be done with the others.

Mr. Sandow said that the PEC is more than happy to pursue this. He said that it took 20 years for the PEC to get the "Welcome" signs replaced and, in fact, they provide a small pot of money that the Township can use to put up its own directional wayfinding signs to the Township activities. He felt that the Township would be more than willing to put up a proper Little League sign at the intersection of Poplar Dr.

Mr. Connor asked if there were any specific recommendations for language change in the proposed ordinance. (There was no response).

Mrs. Raimer asked if it was the consensus of the Board to retain the language that is in Subdivision A or to entertain some discussion about removing the language that prefaces exactly the measure of miles from the street intersection.

Mr. Sandow said that Mr. Pidgeon had inserted it and he, personally, felt it was more than we need. He said that he could figure 3/10 of a mile by eyeball without actually getting out there with a tape measure.

Mr. Connor said that he did not hear anyone wanting to discuss the item.

Mr. Butterworth said that it was because it had been discussed so many times.

Mr. Roshto agreed that it was discussed at length at our last meeting. He was concerned with the number of signs and that 14 may sound like it is not that many but when we talk about how many signs we have today, what state they are in, and how they are inconsistent with each other, it was not clear to him that we are doing the right thing when we are talking about 14 different locations and giving the responsibility to make these decisions with the PEC. He said that the other thing we discussed at the last meeting was the concept of using the wayfaring terminology on the signs instead of using the business names on the signs. He did not see that in this draft ordinance at all. He felt that what Mr. Cilino said earlier made a lot of sense. He asked if we shouldn't be looking at fixing what we have today and *then* come back and talk about these kinds of signs.

Mr. Connor said that if we at least recommend an ordinance to the Township Committee, then they are free to consider our ordinance and then, at the same time, consider how they are going to revise the Township signs. He said that they don't have to return that back to us until they have decided what their preference is but, before sending it back to the Planning Board, they should also agree that the signs that they are responsible for have a similar look and feel as the ones that are under the ordinance control. He said that, if there is agreement to that, he would entertain a motion that the draft ordinance be approved, as written, also recommending that before it is returned to the Planning Board that they discuss and ascertain how signs under their control will be made consistent with whatever ordinance is finally recommended.

Mr. Butterworth agreed to make the motion which was seconded by Mr. Arentowicz.

Mr. Roshto referred to Sec. 155.11(i) which talks about the replacement of signs. He focused on the word "weathered" and wondered if it should be tightened up at all to make it a little stronger to prevent situations where the signs turn into the "white signs" that Mr. Arentowicz had described.

After further discussion, Mr. O'Brien suggested leaving the word "weathered" in and in parenthesis after that write "including, but not limited to, faded and/or difficult to read".

In response to Mr. Cilino, Mr. O'Brien said that he presumed it would be the DPW who would be responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of the signs that are old, weathered, etc. because they would have to remove and replace

them if wanted or necessary. He said that it is triggered by the PEC who would get the sign from the business and provide it to the DPW.

Discussion followed regarding periodic inspections of signs.

Mr. Sandow said that if the Township Committee so desires, he was sure that the PEC would conduct an inventory for the DPW. With regard to weathering, he said that this is comparable to the authority granted to the Zoning Enforcement Officer for *any* sign that a business has on the outside of or on the front of its building. He said that the Zoning Officer in other parts of this section can require that any sign that is weathered, unreadable, or damaged in any way be removed within 30 days. He said that, in general, business owner's signs are well maintained and well kept because it is in their interest.

Mr. Roshto asked Mr. Sandow to explain Sec. 155.3k "Unrelated cleanup of prior business".

Mr. Sandow said that the Sign Ordinance says that for civic events, etc., a limit of 12 lawn signs can be permitted by the Zoning Enforcement Officer which takes care of church rummage sales and the like. There is no limit on the number of political signs or garage sale signs that can be placed. However, if you are holding an event that requires a permit, the limit is 12. During the bike race, he said that the residents of Stirling become concerned that they can't get in an out while the races are running (200 laps around downtown Stirling) and they have to wait for a break in traffic. He said that every year there are complaints that they never get enough notice. They have tried door to door with the Police Explorers and they have tried the U.S. Mail but then the notice doesn't reach the renters and so a few years ago they put up yellow signs a week in advance all around the race course warning the residents so that it is almost impossible to miss them. He said that they put out 40 of them and did it with the permission of the Township Committee. In the Special Event Permit Resolution, he said that there was a sentence tacked on at the bottom that the Chamber and Bike Shop are permitted to put out as many as 40 signs to warn the residents of the event. The reason they are only out for a week is that they are not date and only say "Next Sunday" so that they can be reused from year to year. He said that the next add-on paragraph is from the PEC which legitimatizes the common practice that is always a verbal warning when a permit is issued saying that you can't put signs at the traffic islands at the end of Carlton Rd. or at the Meyersville Circle. Whoever issues the permit always makes that warning verbally and this just puts it into ordinance language. He said that the "Welcome" sign planter boxes are also included because people will put signs in the planter boxes because it is easier to drive them in because of the mulch. He said that they would like to have a 25' buffer around the "Welcome" signs.

Mr. Connor called for a roll call vote.

Mrs. Raimer asked if the Board is agreeing to an ordinance *in concept*, but not an actual finalized version.

Mr. Connor said that the Board would agree to an ordinance and recommend it to the Township Committee with the caveat that they need to work on the signs that they are consistent with and send it back to the Board when they have decided what the consistency is going to be throughout the Township. He said that this is essentially our recommendation as to what we feel signs ought to look like and where they ought to go.

Mrs. Raimer said that we have 2 members of the Township Committee on the Board and said that maybe they could answer the question. She was under the impression that when the Board works on these ordinances, we want to present something to the Township Committee that we want them to "bless". She hated the idea that we have this tremendous "to do" list and said that she would love to be able to take everything off of it because we have successfully completed it. But by handing it over to the Township Committee like this never ending game of "hot potato", she felt that we not getting anything done as efficiently as we could. She said that we are having this very productive discussion here and there is great promise of productivity but she felt that it could be perfected to the point that it could be given to the Township Committee in a format that they could say "I'm comfortable with this" and don't have to hand it back to the Planning Board and we can pass it. Then she said she would feel like we have done a service to the Township Committee instead of burdening them with other things on their agenda. She said that there is wording that perhaps could be added that would enable them to make the decisions that they need to make with regard to the other signs. She said that she was not objecting to this and knew that everyone has worked very hard and wanted to see it come to fruition too. In an effort to make the Board's work more efficient and to move these things along in a more expeditious manner she said that she just wanted to know if there was a way to better the procedure so that we could be more helpful to the Township Committee and not have to do this back and forth with them.

Mr. Connor said that he generally agreed. He said that normally the ordinances that the Board passes are pretty much completely under our control. He said that they may not approve our language but, in this case, there is a whole other piece that needs to be done and he felt that this is the most efficient way to do it because otherwise they start over on something else. He did not know what changes they may make to it – maybe none, but he felt it was a good basis for them to be very efficient and decide, hopefully in one meeting, that we can do this because it is more about look and feel. He felt that the maintenance and other issues are already taken care of in most of the ordinances. He felt that this is a special case and it would be easier to go in this direction.

A roll call vote was taken. Those in favor: Mr. Arentowicz, Mr. Aroneo, Mr. Butterworth, Mr. Smargiassi and Mr. Connor. Those opposed: Mr. Cilino, Mrs. Raimer and Mr. Roshto.

Mr. Connor requested that Mr. O'Brien submit the draft ordinance to the Township Committee with a transmittal letter and that he be able to review the transmittal letter before it is sent.

Mrs. Raimer said that she wished to recognize the work that the PEC did and thanked them for all of their hard work. She expressed appreciation for how they have guided the Board to this point and said that she did not want them to think that her "No" vote meant that she did not approve of the concept. She said that she just wanted to see it passed in another fashion.

Mr. Sandow thanked Mrs. Raimer. He reminded the newer members of the Board that this most recent cycle started in November when a business owner made a pop-up comment at the Township Committee that he had been waiting for off premise signage to happen and the Township Committee thought that it was unfortunate he had waited so long and it was the Township Committee that remanded this to the Planning Board in November with instructions to get moving on it.

Mr. Aroneo said that the same document was in front of the Planning Board back in 2010.

Mr. Sandow expressed appreciation that it was put back at the top of the pile and said he was hoping that it will satisfy the Township Committee.

In response to Mr. Arentowicz, Mr. Sandow confirmed that this started in 2007.

Mr. Cilino said that even now we have a direction but it is not complete, so he could understand why this took 5 years.

Mr. Arentowicz said that he will send a list to the Township Committee tonight or tomorrow morning of the 8 signs that need to be maintained on Valley Rd. and Poplar Dr. and request that the sign posts be looked at as well. He said that he has also taken pictures of the 14 signs at River Rd. and Valley Rd. so that they can see them. He said he would also take some pictures of the sign posts in his development that are rusting away.

X X X X X X X X X

DISCUSSION (CONT'D)

REVIEW OF DRAFT VALLEY ROAD MASTER PLAN ELEMENT

Mr. O'Brien said that at May 3, 2012 meeting, a number of changes were made to the draft Valley Road Master Plan Element and those changes were incorporated into the draft track changes document which shows the changes made to it in preparation for a Master Plan noticed hearing. Mrs. Wolfe has provided notice for that hearing as is required by the statute and he said that he has provided her with a clean copy of the version that is in front of the Board. He asked the Board to review the changes that were made to be sure that they are in keeping with their wishes and that this meets all of the Board's requirements and then this version can be cleaned up and prepared for the noticed hearing.

Mr. Roshto said that he reviewed the changes and felt that they looked consistent with what was discussed at the last meeting. He said that, about ½ hour before this meeting, he sent out two maps and asked what the process would be to have those maps put in. He said that he would like to replace the "Proposed Zoning Districts on Valley Road", essentially putting the Office Zone back in as the proposed ordinance had suggested. Secondly, he said that he updated the Flood Hazard Area Map that he created with Mr. O'Brien's and Mr. Lemanowicz's suggestions.

Mr. O'Brien had further suggestions. He said that, if the Board agrees with the maps, he will put them in. He said reviewed the maps yesterday and believed that there are more changes to come.

Mr. Arentowicz asked for someone to clarify the Office and Business Zone issue that is in question.

Mr. O'Brien replied that it is an undecided issue and the issue is that the original zoning district for the BD-Zone went all the way to Morristown Rd. (which goes back to 2008 when the current document was adopted). In the course of discussions last year when the ordinances that would support this Master Plan were being proposed, he said the Board became aware of other activities on the part of the Township and the Board, and at that point of the ordinance discussion, it was felt that it would be wise for the first 4 properties west of Morristown Rd. to remain as they are currently designated in the O Zone for a number of different purposes. That change was not made in this document. However, if the map is adopted, that would change the boundary of the district to stop at the designated property west of Morristown Rd. instead of going all the way to Morristown Rd.

In response to Mr. Aroneo, Mr. O'Brien said that Mr. Roshto has indicated that his current map includes the O Zone west of Morristown Rd., but it is based upon discussions that occurred last year at this Board which, under the ordinance discussion, wanted to keep the O Zone on those properties just west of Morristown Rd. He said that there was discussion of development on those properties and discussion of possible open space grants on those properties and the Board felt that there was enough discussion and various possibilities that it would be best to leave them in the zone that they are currently in rather than to change them to another zone.

Mr. Aroneo was strongly opposed to treating those properties differently than the rest of the proposed zone. He did not feel it was appropriate just because the Township may have plans for it, or someone else or some developer may have had other plans for that property, to leave them behind. He recalled that it was the driver for the Valley Rd.

rezoning – to clean up the zones that were inconsistent from Main Ave. to Morristown Rd. He said that to leave them behind because the Township had a view on that property is inappropriate and he felt that the Board should include them for better or for worse.

Mr. Roshto said that he would take exception to that and disagreed that the Township Committee drove this. He said that first, the current element (before the change was made) has it as Office and there was a good reason for making it Office at the time that was decided. He said that this Planning Board decided to change it and make the Business District Zone larger. He felt that that was a mistake and that the Planning Board should have left it a smaller and more compact Business District Zone so that we could treat it as the Element talks about a walkable atmosphere for people as opposed to almost 9/10 of a mile along Valley Rd. He said that this Board made the decision to send to the Township Committee an ordinance excluding that Office Zone from the Business District Zone. To him that was a statement of a desire to bring back what some of the residents during the Planning Board comments said - one mile along Valley Rd. is too long. In his opinion, it had nothing to do with what the Township Committee's desire was. He said that there was one individual on this Board last year that said otherwise but it was not the Board's direction.

Mr. Aroneo said that, if that is the case, he was not so opposed to it. He said that he was opposed to this Board making zoning decisions based on the Township's view of a property. So, if the Township is looking at an acquisition, the Township treating that property differently than other properties in the proposed zone is largely inappropriate. In other words, if that was included in the original BD-Zone and, as a result of the Township's interest it was left behind, he felt that that would be a serious problem.

Mr. O'Brien said to remember that the zone is a *proposed* zone and that none of these properties have been changed to a different zone.

Mr. Aroneo said that if it was in the original proposed BD-Zone and then left behind as a result of the Township's decision to file a grant application for that property, he was not in favor of leaving it behind at this point. However, if there is reason to leave it behind for the reason Mr. Roshto stated which is that it is too large of a walkable scale, so that it is not fitting with the scale of the proposed development, that is a different reason, but to leave it behind because the Township is talking about acquiring it, is *not* a good reason.

Mr. O'Brien said that that was not a reason that he specified and the Board should be very careful not to bring that into the discussion because that is something that is outside the realm here. He said that, as he indicated, this Board last year in their discussions felt that there were enough questions about those properties that they felt it was best to leave it in the current zone.

Mr. Connor said that the Master Plan that was adopted did have a recommended zoning map.

Mr. O'Brien agreed and said that it did include those properties in the BD Zone.

Mr. Connor said that if we decide to keep this in the Office Zone, then we will revise the zone recommendation that was in the original Master Plan.

Mr. Aroneo did not think that it mentioned that property at all and just had to do with residential and other bulk issues.

Mr. O'Brien said that the document before the Board contains numerous changes from the original document and it is the Board's prerogative to change documents over the years and it does not have to explain itself as to the nitty-gritty of this property versus that property, but rather in a general way as to what you think in the best zoning for this community.

Mr. Connor guessed that the difficulty would be if we adopted as an ordinance a Zone Plan that was different from the Master Plan, but since we are doing the Master Plan first, that should reduce any chances for that inconsistency.

Mr. O'Brien said that no ordinance was adopted to support the 2008 Master Plan, so the existing ordinances are still in place for the existing zones which have not changed. When and if a revision to the Master Plan is adopted, then that will segue into the ordinance phase and it is up to the Board to recommend ordinances that would support that Plan.

Mr. Connor asked the Board members for their desire on the zoning issue.

Mr. Roshto said that if the Board wishes to keep it as it is, he will definitely update the Flood Hazard Map.

Mr. Connor replied that he felt that the Board has the freedom to do either. He asked which map the Board preferred in the Master Plan.

Mr. Roshto felt that a smaller, more compact Valley Rd. Business District is in keeping with the character or desire of the Element and of our Master Plan.

Mr. Aroneo asked if the Board needed to decide that tonight, in time for the public hearing.

Mr. O'Brien replied, "Yes, unless you want to put off the public hearing". He said that the zone would have to be identified in the document we adopt.

Mr. Connor said that it could be changed at the public hearing.

Mr. O'Brien agreed and in response to Mr. Aroneo confirmed that it can be changed at the public hearing and, at the end of the public hearing, whatever changes are made to the document are incorporated into the document and that becomes final. But if there is a way to clean it up prior to the public hearing, he felt that would make that process a little bit smoother.

Mr. Arentowicz asked Mr. O'Brien for his recommendation.

Mr. O'Brien felt that the biggest concern that came out in the debates that occurred last year on both the Master Plan Element itself and the Ordinance concerned the proposed residential uses along Valley Rd. He said that those residential uses have all been removed, including the COAH references. He said that that was a primary worry, particularly of the properties closest to Morristown Rd. and that worry has probably been erased. He said that it would be consistent to leave those properties in the BD Zone because we have discovered through prior hearings that the O Zone and its very limited mixture of uses has not worked for the community.

Mr. Roshto said that he appreciated what Mr. O'Brien said, however times do change and offices and retail come and go. He said that one of the things in the community section of the Element says "Connect business, recreational, school and municipal uses with sidewalks and walking and bicycle paths". He questioned whether we want a roughly one mile long BD Zone.

Mr. Connor favored keeping the map that was initially introduced for one very important reason. He said that we are reacting to comments that were made in front of the Township Committee on the ordinances, but they were limited in the map aspects. By leaving the original map in the recommendation and having members of the public or Board members comment as to the reasons it should be changed to an O Zone will give the Planning Board a public record. He said that, right now, we have interpreted what we have heard and there is no question about what we heard on the residential side. He did not feel there was nearly that amount of discussion on the O Zone. He said that he would like to have a better public record on the O Zone to make the change and then, if the public record so shows, he would have no problem changing it to the O Zone at the time of the meeting.

Mr. Arentowicz said that he wanted to get close to where we need to be, so why would we go into the public meeting – just for more input, are we trying to get it right, or do we want the public to help us get it right?

Mr. Connor said that the issue he had is the fact that, if by some reason we were challenged, we need to have a public record before the Planning Board. He said that a lot of the public record is before the Township Committee but he was not sure how that relates to having the public record before the Planning Board.

Mr. Roshto said that he heard enough that he felt it would be wise for him to retract his suggestion for now and, if he would like to bring it up later, he will.

Mr. Smargiassi said that if he recalled correctly, some of the original thought of making the BD Zone bigger was to create some uniformity and consistency throughout Valley Rd. He concurred with the thought that the business district is too large and that we really want to focus on redevelopment and our business district in the areas that we want it. He said that he referenced the Warren Twp. plan for the Warrenville Center where they have a very concentrated what you may consider a BD District where there is retail, shops, and grocery stores and surrounding that is more of a transitional zone with professional offices, not so much retail establishments. He said that if you read their plan, it does create a nice buffer from a BD Zone to a residential zone. He said that, although not shown on this map, on the other side of the O Zone, is residential and across the street is a park. He said that there is some thought, and it has been discussed by this Board, of having some buffer from the BD Zone, so he would just add that as something to consider for the next meeting.

Mr. Connor asked if there were any other recommended changes over and above the ones that were made and incorporated into the 6/12/12 document.

Mr. O'Brien said that, at some places, he did ask questions of the Board as to what their guidance will be. He referred to the bottom of Pg. 3 under "Environmental Best Practices" and said that a comment made at the last meeting was to add a goal concerning flood mitigation. He said that, with Mrs. Wolfe's help, he quoted the Chairman in the first paragraph and offered some other (perhaps alternate) language in the second paragraph.

Mr. Roshto said that he liked what Mr. O'Brien had written except that he believed what Mr. Connor had said the last time was stronger.

Mr. Cilino said that on protecting lives and property from flood damage sounded to him (from an outside perspective) that that is in our control. He said that we can do something and that we have to focus on it, which means that we are giving it a priority, but we are not protecting lives and property – that is an offshoot of focusing on it, but it is not within our control to actually do that.

Mr. Roshto said that that was what was exactly on his mind.

Based on Mr. Cilino's comments, Mr. O'Brien suggested using the phrase "focus on flood mitigation" and then jump down to "focus on flood mitigation to protect lives and property from flood damage".

Mr. Cilino felt that "protect lives and property from flood damage" is making a statement that that is within our control. He did not see that protecting lives and property from flood damage is really something within the scope of what we can do. He said that we can affect it, but we can't do it – there are things outside of our control. He asked if it was reasonable to assume that we can protect lives and property from flood damage, and he did not think it is.

Mrs. Raimer suggested "mitigate flood damage through stormwater control and management and other appropriate flood remediation practices to enable Valley Rd. to be a viable commercial area".

Mr. Aroneo said that he liked what Mr. Connor had said initially. He said that we actually debated that and talked about it.

Mr. Cilino agreed.

Mrs. Raimer felt it is not about the wordsmithing. She noticed that when Mr. O'Brien writes these bulleted points, it is almost like writing a resume and he was trying to create a format for the Board. She said that Mr. O'Connor's comment is supportive of the comment and we probably want to keep the format consistent because it is explaining what we are looking for without really giving a direct statement. She said that we don't create this kind of explanation for the other bullets. She said that it is just a stylistic thing to conform to what Mr. O'Brien had presented to the Board. She had no objection to any of it, but it is why she went in that direction.

Mr. Roshto asked what might be added to make this one bullet stand out as *the* priority. He said that what we all liked about what Mr. Connor had said which was to focus on flood mitigation because without it you are not going to have a business district, it will just continue to flood. He said that that came across to the Board as very, very important. He asked what we would say to bring that up to the top.

Mrs. Raimer replied, what if we rework it so that that is on the top, with the other bullets to follow, so that it is more explanatory with the other supportive bullets to follow.

Mr. O'Brien replied that you could add a sentence or paragraph in the Vision Statement and use *some* language as a bullet point under environmental best practices. To show an emphasis, he suggested that the Board do both.

Mr. Roshto felt that that was a great idea.

Mrs. Raimer said that she would support it.

Mr. Connor felt that it was a good idea because it is something of primary importance to the community.

Mr. O'Brien suggested using Mrs. Raimer's draft language as a bullet point, consistent with the other bullet points, and make it the very first one under "Environmental Best Practices". He said that we could work on at least a sentence that incorporates Mr. Connor's viewpoint.

Mr. Connor agreed and said that, hopefully, Mr. O'Brien can turn that around soon.

In response to Mrs. Raimer, it was agreed to notice this for a public hearing on 6/12/12. Therefore, Mrs. Raimer said that we would want to perfect that language right here and now (for the Vision Statement and the bullets). She suggested that it may be possible to work on it during a recess.

Mr. Connor called for a 10 minute recess.

X X X X R E C E S S X X X X

Mr. O'Brien said that a new bullet point will be added as the first bullet point under "Environmental Best Practices" on Pg. 3. The bullet point will read "Mitigate flood damage through stormwater control and management and other appropriate flood remediation practices to enable Valley Rd. to be a viable commercial area". On Pg. 2 (which is part of the "Vision Statement", he said that a new paragraph will be added which would be above the very last paragraph of that section which starts with "This Master Plan Element shall be known.." and underneath the paragraph above it which starts "Long Hill Township's dedication to a semi-rural community"... and Mr. Smargiassi has that wording.

Mr. Smargiassi said that it would read that "We recognize that sections of the Valley Road Business District flood as demonstrated by the five 100 Year Storms Long Hill Township has experienced since 2000. In addition, Valley Rd. is virtually surrounded by Flood Hazard Areas of the Passaic River. As a result, this Master Plan Element highly recommends the utilization of stormwater control and management and other appropriate flood mitigation practices to ensure that the Valley Rd. Business District remains a commercially viable area".

Mr. Connor asked the Board members if they had any comments regarding the above two additions.

Mr. Arentowicz felt that they were good.

Mr. O'Brien referred to Pg. 4 and said that language was added concerning Complete Streets at the very bottom of Item No. 4 (above Item No. 5) and noted that the language is new.

After discussion, it was agreed to change the wording to read "Encourage a 'Complete Streets' policy for Valley Road which would accommodate all road users of all abilities for all trips and make Valley Road safe and convenient for all users, including children, persons with disabilities, bicyclists, motorists, seniors, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, and users of public transport".

Mr. O'Brien referred to Pg. 7 and said that this, and everything subsequent to it in the document, becomes background studies and so it becomes two different sections. He said that the list of folks involved goes from 2008 and asked the Board for its preference.

Mr. Connor recalled that the second portion (background studies) was going to be a separate document.

Mr. O'Brien said that it should be the second half of the document, which would be consistent with what was done with other Master Plan Elements.

Mrs. Raimer asked if it would be an appendix.

In response to Mr. Connor, Mr. O'Brien said that it became Sec. IV due to the pages, etc. which is not reflected on the first page because he didn't want to change the Table of Contents until the document was finished. He said that it is reflected on Pg. 7 where Item No. VI (the background studies) incorporates all of the background studies in one section and that is an appendix. He said that this Board adopts it all, however when the Element is handed out, you only have to give out the first 6 pages and can give out the background studies as you wish. He said that they should all be available to the public.

In response to Mr. Roshto, Mr. O'Brien confirmed that all background studies are an appendix to each Element currently. After further discussion, he said that the background studies are part of the 1996 Master Plan. The first half of that document are the various Elements of the Plan and the second half of that document are the background studies. He said that the *entire* document (both the Element *and* the background studies) has to be adopted by the Board. Because we are doing the Elements piecemeal, rather than as part of one large document, to be consistent he said that we should have the background studies as the second half of the document so that down the road when a larger Master Plan is put together, it can be separated into a background study chapter of *all* of the various Elements. He said that, right now, it should be adopted together in one piece.

Mr. Roshto was not sure he agreed. He said that he saw it as you have background studies, we adopt those background studies, and those background studies should be placed at the end of the Master Plan and be *separate* from the Element. He said that the Element should simply reference Background Study 1.3.

Mr. O'Brien replied that, because we don't have a whole Master Plan at this point that is being adopted, these should really stay together until a Land Use Element is adopted which will have background studies and then they will all be put after those chapters.

Mr. Roshto replied, or we could take the background study and give it a number – that is No. 1 of all of our background studies and the next background study is No. 2 and that is a document that lives with our Master Plan and then is consistent with where we were talking about going.

Mr. O'Brien replied that the Land Use Element is the primary and required Element according to the MLUL, so if you name Valley Rd. as the first Element, then Land Use would come after but....

Mr. Roshto interrupted and said that if he said that, he misspoke. He said that he was talking about the background studies. He did not think it would matter that the background study here could be No. 1 and the Land Use background study could be No. 2.

Mr. Connor said that we could put this in the background study that is associated with this and, perhaps, not put a No. 1 because by then when we do the Land Use, we could put it in such an order that the Land Use background study is placed *before* this particular study.

Mr. O'Brien understood Mr. Roshto's general idea which is a clean idea and the way to go. However, because we are not adopting an entire Master Plan (which is what happened back in 1996), instead we are doing it piecemeal. He said that each of the Elements we have adopted since 1996 have been the Element and the background studies together.

Mr. Connor said that at some point in time we have got to go through and separate them out.

Mr. O'Brien said that perhaps the time to do that would be after the Land Use Element is adopted and then you've got a sizeable Element and you can take whatever studies have been done up until that point and replace the 1996 Master Plan in the book.

Mr. Roshto said that that sounded like a lot of work to him because you would have to go through every Element and make sure that whatever you number that background study, that Element references it. He felt that what will end up

happening is that we are, by default, agreeing that the background studies will remain with the Elements. It will be one way or the other because later we are not going to decide to do all that work at once.

Mr. O'Brien said that the Board does not have to take any step on that, that is clerical because you have adopted them and, to go in the book, you just separate them.

Mr. Roshto said that it sounds easy.

Mr. O'Brien replied that he wouldn't have suggested it if he thought we would have to go through an entire process to do it.

Mr. Roshto said that someone has to read each Element and make sure that every reference in the Element is correctly referencing the background study.

Mr. O'Brien replied that there are only 3 Elements at this point that have been adopted since 1996.

Mr. Roshto replied that it is better to do it now than when we have done all of the Elements.

Mr. O'Brien agreed.

Mr. Connor felt that the Board should look at the Elements that were adopted and those that we plan to adopt and put in an index for the background study now and adopt an index. He said that we know how many there are going to be and put in that No. 1 is the Elements and No 2 is whatever it is and establish that as an index and then when we pass this, we can put it into whatever has been designated at No. 3, No. 10, or No. 1. He said that we can then also take the 3 others that were passed and start that process and by having at least a full index of those background studies that we plan to have.

Mr. O'Brien asked if it would help if we removed No. 6 from in front of the background studies and just labeled it a background study and then, as time goes on, we just take the background studies and put them in a separate section of the Master Plan and just call it Background Studies Post 1996.

Mr. Roshto replied, so long as we can reference it. His only concern was that if we don't give it a number now, how are you referencing it in the Elements?

Mr. Connor said that it is like writing a document. He said that you'll list the attachments that you are going to have, but that doesn't mean when you initially write the document you write all of the attachments. You essentially write the document and then you have a list of 6 attachments and then start putting in the attachments. He said that that is usually the last thing you do. He felt it is the same process.

Mr. Roshto replied that we are talking about a 300+ page document here.

Mr. Connor understood, but did not think it would be that difficult.

Mr. Roshto said that it seemed trivial to him to put a number on the background study and then increment the numbers as we go.

Mr. Connor said that it made more sense to him as you decide what the numbering scheme is going to be and then you just put them in to whatever the numbering scheme is realizing that there are blanks that you are going to fill in as you go forward.

Mr. Roshto said, again, you will have to go back to every Element to make sure you reference the correct number later.

Mr. Connor did not feel it was a problem and that we are trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist.

Mr. Roshto asked if our background studies aren't referenced in our Elements?

Mr. O'Brien replied that they refer to them although did not believe that this Element ever says "go to Pg. 28, Paragraph 3 to look at this".

Mr. Connor said that his recollection is that it is essentially data that we looked at.

Mr. Roshto said that, if we don't reference them in our Elements, then it is a non-issue.

Mr. Arentowicz did not think it gets referenced in the Element.

Perhaps to try to be consistent from past to future, Mr. O'Brien said that instead of putting a number on this as a background study, we call it the Valley Rd. Business District Background Study and put them all in alphabetical order as we do them, with the exception of Land Use (which always comes first).

Mrs. Raimer and Mr. Connor said that it sounded fine.

Mr. Roshto also said that it was fine.

Mr. Connor said that the listing of who was there when it was adopted will be moved into the background material.

Mr. O'Brien said that the 2008 Board wrote the old Master Plan, so this is really moot.

Mr. Arentowicz asked if the maps which were discussed previously are part of the background studies.

After extensive discussion, Mr. O'Brien confirmed that the Board wants to keep the current Zoning Map in the background and the proposed Zoning Map in the Element itself.

Mr. Butterworth said that the public does need to see what the current and proposed Zoning Maps are so that they can see the difference.

Mr. O'Brien said that it is up to the Board as to whether it wants to make them available or not available.

Mr. Connor said that they should just be background material for the audience.

Mr. Aroneo said that everything should be on the website.

Mr. Connor asked if there were any other changes.

Mr. O'Brien said that we have the proposed zoning district map followed by the flood hazard area map. He asked the Board if it wished to keep the proposed zoning district map the way it is.

Mr. Connor said that the two maps are so essential that they should be in the first section and the other material should be in the background section.

Mr. Arentowicz asked what happened with the Valley Rd. Ordinance between 2008 and 2012.

Mr. O'Brien replied that the Master Plan had been adopted by the Planning Board in 2008 and they failed to adopt ordinances to support it.

Mr. Connor said that it was initially the Planning Board who didn't provide a recommendation for ordinances and then they have been provided but are obviously back for a redo.

Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. Arentowicz if he would like those statements to be more encompassing.

Mr. Arentowicz replied that it leaves an open question of what happened in the 3 years.

Mr. Butterworth said that the Board reopened the issued and redid it. He said that, if you want a statement in the background that is fine, because that is what happened.

Mr. Aroneo said that it does say that they revisited the Master Plan.

Mr. Connor suggested leaving it as it is. He did not want to make any more changes so that we could hold the public hearing. He felt that it may be a reasonable thing to introduce at the public hearing.

Mr. Cilino did not see where that is rewriting anything and encompasses only a couple of words or a sentence. He felt that it is just an addition to point one in the right direction.

In that case, Mr. Connor said that it would need to be rewritten tonight before it is adopted. He asked the Board if felt it should be rewritten tonight or if it could wait to be rewritten on June 12th given that there is a recommendation to do so.

Mr. Arentowicz said that the response will be that in 2012 it got revisited. He suggested leaving it as is.

Mr. O'Brien asked if there were any further comments on the paragraphs which were added at the end. (There were none).

Mr. Connor called for a motion that the Planning Board adopt the revised draft Valley Rd. Business District of the Master Plan for public hearing for adoption on June 12, 2012.

A motion was made by Mr. Roshto made the motion which was seconded by Mr. Aroneo.

A roll call vote was taken. Those in favor: Mr. Arentowicz, Mr. Aroneo, Mr. Butterworth, Mr. Cilino, Mrs. Raimer, Mr. Roshto, Mr. Smargiassi and Mr. Connor. Those opposed: None.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the Board members will receive a clean copy (with no track changes) which will reflect everything that has been decided.

Mrs. Wolfe will serve notice of the proposed adoption as required.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Mr. Sandow asked if this will be mailed to everyone within 200' of one mile of Valley Rd.

Mr. O'Brien replied, "No". He said that it will be mailed to the County and the Clerks of the surrounding municipalities. He said that this is a Master Plan Element and not an ordinance and it does not have to be mailed

X X X X X X X

DISCUSSION

DRAFT CONSERVATION ELEMENT

Mr. O'Brien said that he had distributed two versions of the draft Conservation Element based upon comments/corrections/edits that he had received from various members of the Board which the Chair requested back in April. The first version had numerous comments which made it difficult for him to incorporate the other comments, therefore he kept it as two different versions. He suggested going through one at a time and then try to put them together. He said that, at the bottom of the first page of the first version it says "Conservation Plan PB Draft GR 04-24-12" and at the bottom of the first page of the second version it says "Conservation Plan draft MS and CA edits 050312". Due to the lateness of the hour, he suggested going through the second version first because it had fewer comments. He said that it represents suggestions from Mr. Smargiassi and Mr. Arentowicz which start on Pg. 2.

With regard to his comment on the last bullet point ("Land use decisions within the Passaic River basin continue to..."), Mr. Smargiassi said that he felt it should just be "continued impact" because there couldn't be land use decisions that positively or negatively impact. He said that the way it is written it assumes that all of the decisions will be negative. He said that we have actually put more water into retention basins and drywells where we have actually improved the situation. There were no objections from the Board.

Mr. Smargiassi said that throughout the document it refers to Best Management Practices and it was previously discussed and thought to be confusing because there is a Best Management Practices Manual and, at times, when you read through this document you are not sure if it is referring directly to that Manual (because it is capitalized, in which case when he read it he felt it was referring back to the Manual), or in certain areas where it is referred as Best Management Practices we should maybe take that out and talk about more modern stormwater management techniques or stormwater management techniques. He said that he wished to point it out and did not make that change throughout the document.

After further discussion, Mr. O'Brien confirmed that the Board agreed to spell out Best Management Practices only in conjunction with major development and to use the Stormwater Management Manual that has been developed by the Township for anything else in terms of BMP identification. He then asked if any of the other comments/edits needed to be discussed.

Mr. Arentowicz said that his point on Item 5 (to protect the Township's critical areas), he felt that somewhere we need to identify where those critical areas are in the Township. He noted that they are not in the document.

Mr. O'Brien said that a start may be to perhaps use the Flood Map as a reference in the back. He said that that is half of it and the other half is steep slopes. Although we do not have them mapped, he believed that the County does.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the County has topography but they don't have the slope ranges highlighted, but you could get the topography and figure it out. He said that the County's topo is 4' intervals where our Ordinance requires 2' intervals and he recalled that it goes to 5' intervals if it gets really steep. In essence, he said that that map is not available and there is data available to start with, but you would have to create it.

Mr. Connor felt that would be a useful map to have.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that he had created a sub map a couple of years ago and could create one again with the firm he is with now. He said that the one he created had flood plain, wetlands, and steep slopes, in addition to the parcels, street names, zoning lines, etc. He said that one could be done for the whole town and he noted that Long Hill already has digital tax maps and, basically, it could all be combined. In that way, the Building Dept. could have the Tax Maps and a set of Environmental Constraints Maps (or whatever you would want to call them). It would be on the Tax Map base, but would contain the topography and steep slope ranges that the Ordinance makes reference to. It would also have the NJDEP wetlands, which is based upon aerial photography. He noted that it is not accurate but will give you an idea that there *might* be a wetland here. He said that, with another client, he actually added *another* layer where whenever a developer came in and they did a wetlands delineation, he put that line on there too, so that you actually build the actual wetland as people come in.

In response to Mr. Connor, Mr. Lemanowicz said that he could develop the cost of preparing such a map. He said that the one he did as a sample only took a few hours to do the one sheet. He said that where he has developed a whole town like that, he has used it for COAH investigations, when towns have looked for open space, zoning, etc.

Mr. Connor felt that such a map would be very useful to the Township, in general, and not just the Planning Board.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that he would try to bring a copy of the whole town one that he did in the past.

Mr. O'Brien said that any maps that would be developed should be included.

Mrs. Raimer agreed that such a map is very important but noted the tightness of the Township budgets and just wanted to be sure that the Board would have the resources to cover it.

Mr. O'Brien said that Item #7 under "Conservation Goals and Recommendations" is flagged to discuss. After extensive discussion, he confirmed that under Item #7 the words "more stringent tree removal regulations" will be removed and replaced with "targeted tree preservation and removal", followed by the formation of a tree bank.....etc.

Referring to Item #8, Mr. Arentowicz said that the comment is that we are going to need to have some type of balance between the clean up, whether that be tree removal, the shoals, or possibly dredging and there has got to be a balance between that and what we want to do with the ecosystems. He did not think that the way it is worded the Board could fully support the balancing of the ecosystem when we have got a major clean-up facing us.

After further discussion, it was agreed to reword Item #8 as follows "To support where appropriate regional efforts aimed at protecting and restoring the ecosystems of the Great Swamp and the Passaic River corridor".

Due to the lateness of the hour, Mr. Connor said that if a motion is not made to extend this meeting, this discussion will continue at the next meeting.

Mr. O'Brien said that, at the next meeting, we have scheduled the Master Plan hearing and the Tifa redevelopment presentation which will probably take the full evening.

Mr. Connor suggested that those two items remain on the agenda and, if the Master Plan hearing ends early, we will continue this discussion as a third item on the agenda.

Mr. Smargiassi said that he would like to have the Board's legal counsel present at the meeting for the Master Plan hearing and Tifa redevelopment presentation.

Mr. Connor agreed.

Mr. O'Brien asked if there were any recommendations from the Board on proceeding with the Conservation Element or if they wished to leave it as it is right now and work on the two documents that we have.

Mr. Connor felt that it was working fine having them side by side.

Mr. O'Brien said that he would not make any changes to the document based on what was done tonight.

The meeting adjourned at 11:02 P.M.

DAWN V. WOLFE
Planning & Zoning Administrator