

**TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY**

**REGULAR MEETING
December 15, 2016**

This Regular Meeting of the Township of Franklin Zoning Board of Adjustment was held at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey and was called to order by Robert Thomas, Chairperson, at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read and the roll was called as follows:

PRESENT: Raymond Betterbid, Laura Graumann, Gary Rosenthal, Joel Reiss, Cheryl Bergailo and Chairman Thomas

ABSENT: Donald Johnson, Bruce McCracken, Alan Rich, Robert Shepherd and Anthony Caldwell

ALSO PRESENT: Board Attorney, Patrick Bradshaw, Mark Healey, Planning Director, and Vincent Dominach, Senior Zoning Officer

MINUTES:

- **Regular Meeting – November 2, 2016**

Vice Chair Graumann made a motion to approve the Minutes as submitted. Mr. Betterbid seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Ms. Bergailo and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

DISCUSSION:

Vouchers:

- **Patrick Bradshaw – December, 2016 Retainer - \$865.00**
 - Caraballo – Resolution - \$175.00
 - Raritan Valley Habitat – Resolution - \$385.00
 - Howard – Resolution - \$140.00
 - St. Peter’s Healthcare System – Resolution - \$367.50

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Vouchers as submitted. Vice Chair Graumann seconded the motion and all were in favor.

HEARINGS:

- **MONTAUK TRANSIT SERVICE, LLC / ZBA-16-00035**

Site Plan w/Use Variance in which the Applicant was looking for approval to use the site as a bus company and store busses at 925 & 945 Route #27, Somerset; Block 88.01, Lots 7 & 9.01, in an M-2 Zone - **CARRIED TO JANUARY 5, 2017 – with no further notification required.**

- **PARAMASAMY CHANDRANATHAN / ZBA-16-00009**

Hardship Variance in which the Applicant was requesting a variance for an undersized lot, where 5 acres is the minimum and 2.73 acres is existing/proposed at 4292 Route #27, Somerset; Block 6, Lot 24.01, in an RR-5 Zone - **CARRIED TO FEBRUARY 16, 2017 – with no further notification required.**

- **CARLOS DEGOIAS / ZBA-16-00042**

Hardship Variance in which the Applicant was seeking permission for an existing carport that did not receive approval at 151 Second Street, Somerset; Block 460, Lot 7, in an R-20 Zone .

Mr. Dominach explained that Mr. DeGoias erected a carport without knowing it needed approvals. He went on to tell the Board that when he found out that he needed approvals, he came to the Township, where it was discovered that he also now needed variances as well.

Mr. Dominach's Zoning report indicated that the following variances were required:

1. Side yard setback for the carport, where 15 ft. is the minimum and 7 ft. is existing/proposed.
2. Side yard setback for the garden shed, where 5 ft. is the minimum and 3 ft. is existing/proposed.
3. Side yard setback for the house, where 15 ft. is the minimum and 13.9 ft. is existing/proposed.
4. Impervious coverage, where 25% is the maximum and 32% is existing/proposed.

Mr. Carlos DeGoias, Applicant, came forward and was sworn in.

Vice Chair Graumann asked if Mr. DeGoias spoke to his neighbors about it. He said that he did and no one had a problem with the carport being there.

Seeing no one in the public present, Chairman Thomas refrained from opening the meeting to the public.

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Application for Hardship Variance. Vice Chair Graumann seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Mr. Betterbid, Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, Ms. Bergailo and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **DOUBLESTONE HOLDINGS, LLC / ZBA-16-00039**

Mr. Francis P. Linnus, Esq., Attorney appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Doublestone Holdings, LLC. Mr. Linnus explained that they were there that evening for a Sign Variance in which the Applicant was seeking approval for a sign that was erected in the wrong spot at 315 Route #27, Franklin Park; Block 34.05, Lot 50.01, in a NB Zone.

Mr. Dominach stated that the sign was installed six years ago, in 2010, and they got permits, but was installed in the wrong place. Several years later the Township notified the owners and were trying to figure out the best way to handle the situation. He stated that they originally wanted them to move the sign, but between the cost of doing so and the fact that there was a water main underneath it, but with no easement. He then stated that the Applicant agreed to keep the sign where it is so there would be no cost to them for having to move it, but would be agreeable to grant the Township an easement for the water main in the future should it be necessary. If that should occur, Mr. Dominach stated that the Applicant would be willing to move the sign and grant the easement since it was required to be set back 10 ft. from the property line and was on the property line presently. Mr. Dominach stated that there was no problem with sight distances and was inspected and installed properly, just in the wrong location.

Mr. Linnus testified that they received a memorandum from the Township's Technical Review Committee, and that they can comply with all the comments included.

Chairman Thomas then opened the meeting to the public for questions or comments.

Ms. Marley Davis, 2 DeKale Lane, Somerset, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. Ms. Davis asked for clarification on language in the report that appeared to allow the Applicant a waiver from design standards. She was concerned that they would be able to change the sign into the future. Mr. Bradshaw explained that that was language placed there in case the Board wanted to have the sign moved at this time and it would provide for putting the public on notice that that might happen. Mr. Healey explained that it did not allow for the Applicant anything else, unless they came back before the Board again.

Vice Chair Graumann made a motion to approve the Application, subject to the requirement that should the sign need to be moved at a later date, the Applicant would provide the Township with an easement and move the sign at its own cost. Mr. Reiss seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Mr. Betterbid, Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, Ms. Bergailo and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **101 METTLERS ROAD, LLC / ZBA-16-00036**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, 101 Mettlers Road, LLC and Central Jersey College Prep Charter School. Mr. Lanfrit explained that they were before the Board that evening to obtain Site Plan w/Use and Sign Variances in which the Applicant was looking to convert roughly one half of their building into a charter school at 101 Mettlers Road, Somerset; Block 511, Lot 1.02, in the ROL Zone - **CARRIED TO JANUARY 5, 2017 – with no further notification required.**

Mr. Lanfrit explained that the Application before the Board was designed to relocate the existing Central Jersey College Prep Charter School, located on Schoolhouse Road to 101 Mettlers Rd. He went on to explain that there had been two previous applications with respect to the possible relocation of the school. Mr. Lanfrit stated that the Applicant now had an agreement with the Mettlers Rd. property owner to lease the property for the charter school and were hoping to relocate the school by September, 2017 for the new school year. He also told the Board that the building that they are presently in was not the best situation and that they needed to get out of that building.

Mr. Lanfrit noticed that there were only six (6) Board members present that evening, and may use his right to defer any vote until he had a full quorum of seven (7) Board members.

The variances required, as detailed in Mr. Healey's Planning report, are as follows:

1. Use Variance: Schools are not a permitted use in the R-O-L Zoning district.
2. Side Yard: 200 feet required – 130.62 feet proposed to gymnasium addition
3. Total Side Yard: 50 ft. required – 486.44 ft. existing
4. Setback to Gas Transmission Line: 100 ft. required – 74.23 feet proposed to gymnasium addition
5. Sign Area (school): 25 sq. ft. permitted – 60.64 sq. ft. proposed (40 sq. ft. of sign face, with the remaining 20.24 sq. feet consisting of stone supports.

Mr. Craig Stires, Engineer and Principal of Stires Associates, PA, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Stires entered into the record as Exhibit A-1, which was a colorized rendering of one of the plan set sheets, Sheet 5 of 6, Grading Utility & Soil Erosion Plan. He then took the Board through the existing conditions on the property, noting that it included approximately 29 acres, and he believed was the former Exxon facility. He noted that there were 282 existing parking spaces, with a storm water detention basin in the front of the building along Mettlers Rd. with just over 262,000 sq. ft. in the existing building. He noted that only a portion of the existing building would be used for the school's purposes, and Mr. Stires showed the portion that would be utilized for the school and where an addition would be added for a gymnasium. He noted that the larger portion of the current building was vacant and would not be used by the school. He noted the need for a Use Variance because schools are not a permitted use in the R-O-L (Research/Office/Laboratory) Zone as well as some existing setback variances. Mr. Stires then told the Board that there would be a new variance for the setback to a gas transmission line because the new, proposed gymnasium would be less than 100 ft. away. Mr. Stires then testified that the representatives of the gas transmission lines were okay with what was being proposed with the construction of a new gymnasium. He got confirmation of their agreement via e-mail and can provide the Board with a hard copy.

Mr. Stires then drew the Board's attention to the looped road that runs from the front of the building around to the rear parking lot and noted that they would have to bump it out a bit around the new gymnasium building. He added that they would also be added new sidewalks along that roadway. Mr. Stires then talked about vehicular traffic entering and exiting the site, showing the various directions busses would enter and exit and how teachers/staff as well as students and visitors would navigate the site. He indicated that he would also comply with comments for extra directional signage, based upon staff comments, in order to direct people to the areas on the site they need to go. Mr. Stires stated that they would be able to stack approximately 26 busses, with 8 busses able to stack next to the new sidewalk that follows the roadway to the entrance. Mr. Stires indicated that any teachers, parents or students would have two means of exiting the parking lot, either from one of the roadways on each side and out to the main entrance, without having to navigate any portion of the looped road the busses would be utilizing.

Mr. Stires then discussed the signage for the school, noting that they were planning to utilize the existing freestanding sign that is on the front of the property, but that was placed somewhat far off of Mettlers Rd. Mr. Healey stated that the sign was a complying sign when the use was permitted in the zone, but because school's were not permitted in the zone, the size of the sign falls in line with what would be acceptable in a zone that schools are a permitted use. Mr. Stires testified that the sign was 12 ft. x 40 inches, but that the measurements only included the sign and not the pillars.

Mr. Stires then spoke about the fact that the addition of the proposed gymnasium building did increase the impervious coverage, but did not go over what was allowed by the State for the current storm water management system. He did, however, indicated that they were planning to modify the system in order to comply with the Township standards, which had already been reviewed by the Township Engineer's office.

Mr. Stires then drew the Board's attention to the staff reports, noting that the Health Dept. wanted to know if there was public water and sewer available on-site and what, if any, was the use of the well located on the plans. Mr. Stires stated that he believed the site was serviced by public water and sewer and that the Applicant plans to abandon the well on the property.

Mr. Stires addressed the Assistant Township Engineer's report, dated December 6, 2016, and that the plans shown on the exhibit have already had a number of iterations and several meetings with Township staff to review the plans. He didn't believe that there were still any "Not Satisfied" notations next to any comments that they couldn't comply with. He indicated that item #27 in the Township Engineer's report stated the request to eliminate the sharp curve in front of the gymnasium to create a smooth curb transition for the buses staging. Since he was trying to keep the roadway as far away from the gas transmission line as possible, he agreed to work with the Township Engineer's office for agreement. A discussion ensued between Mr. Healey and Mr. Stires regarding the size of the proposed gymnasium building, and a discussion of item #9 on the Township Engineer's report regarding the gymnasium's close proximity to the roadway was included. Mr. Dominach suggested they work with the Township Engineer's office to resolve the issues. Mr. Stires stated that they would be able to comply with all other comments in the Township Engineers report.

Mr. Stires then addressed Mr. Healey's Planning report, noting that they can add the turning radii of the busses to the plan. He also stated that they were planning to make the ring road a

one-way road, so Mr. Healey stated that they would have to add the appropriate signage to the plan to direct motorists in the way they should navigate the site. Mr. Healey was interested in finding out how parents would be dropping off students, and Mr. Lanfrit indicated that there was a portion of the parking lot, close to the school building, where parents could park and walk their children into the school where faculty and/or staff would be waiting. Mr. Healey also directed Mr. Stires' attention to item #5 regarding parking, where he noted that their parking chart had too many parking spots assigned to different areas and not enough parking spots in others. Mr. Stires indicated that he would revise the parking calculations based upon the items listed in item #5 in the Planner's report.

Mr. Healey then directed his attention to the remainder of the building as it related to parking requirements. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that there was no user of the remainder of the building presently and testified that they would come back before the Board or TRC to discuss the multi-use of the facility, should that occur. He indicated that there was enough space to make modifications to the building and parking when or if an additional user comes forward to use the space. A discussion among the Board ensued. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that the owner of the building would be responsible for paying for any additional parking or modifications for any additional user. Mr. Stires entered into the record as Exhibit A-2, an aerial photograph of the property to assist the Board members. He noted that the impervious coverage requirement was to a maximum of 30% and that they were at 25% with the proposed plan, so there was some wiggle room if additional parking were needed. Finally, Mr. Stires indicated that they can comply with all other comments in Mr. Healey's Planning report.

Ms. Bergailo opened a discussion regarding item #3 in Mr. Healey's Planning report. Mr. Stires indicated that they thought they could fit the proposed gymnasium into a little notch next to the portion of the building that the school would be utilizing, keeping all of the space together. He also stated that he kept the addition as small as he could and by only incorporating 5 rows of bleacher seating. A discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. Lanfrit stated that they were seeking a variance for the setback to the gas transmission line because they were violating the Township Ordinance, not because the building was going to be anywhere within the pipeline easement.

Chairman Thomas opened the meeting to the public for questions of the Engineer. Seeing no one coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. David H. Feldman, Architect & Principal of Feldman & Feldman Architects, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Feldman entered into the record as Exhibit A-3, the architectural elevations prepared by his office and Exhibit A-4, the floor plans that were prepared. Mr. Feldman took the Board through the changes to the building that would be made for the project, notably the gymnasium of approximately 9,800 sq. ft. He then indicated that all the other parts of the building would remain the same. The materials utilized in constructing the gymnasium would be of a stucco paneled system, which would be colored to match the existing building. He discussed the building wings that would be utilized for classrooms and comprised of two levels. He then briefly described how the students would get into the building and how the building operated, noting the one entrance from the parking area for students who are dropped off and the entrance by the gymnasium for drop off by the busses. He noted that the grades would be separated into wings, with K-4 together, 5-7 together and 8-12 on the lower level of one of the wings. Other facilities included in the building, as detailed by Mr. Feldman, were restroom facilities, cafeteria, gymnasium, nurse's

office, library, computer room, biology lab, language, music and any other specialty room. He then discussed the reasoning for locating the cafeteria and gymnasium where he did, noting that they were repurposing the current cafeteria in its present location. Mr. Feldman then indicated that there were two choices for locating the gymnasium; in its current location or as discussed earlier between the two wings. He indicated that by placing the gymnasium between the two wings, it would not have the close proximity to the cafeteria they wanted and they would lose a substantial number of windows from the two wings, reducing the light and air in the classrooms. He added that they added an auditorium in the second floor of the upper class wing if they had an event. Mr. Feldman indicated that all retrofits would be made to have the buildings operate efficiently for a school use as well as be made ADA compliant.

Vice Chair Graumann asked about whether there would be chemistry and biology labs and whether or not the lower school would have an auditorium available for their use. Mr. Feldman indicated that the upper classes would have the labs and Mr. Lanfrit stated that the lower school would be able to utilize the gymnasium or the cafeteria for larger gatherings.

Mr. Healey asked about whether the classrooms would be attached to other parts of the building, and Mr. Feldman stated that they would have the main entrance as well as the entrance from the other portion of the building not being utilized by the school that goes into the cafeteria, which they plan to have closed off. A discussion ensued regarding where students go after being dropped off by either their parents or busses.

Mr. Reiss asked about how handicapped students would get to the lower levels, and Mr. Feldman stated that there would be two elevators provided as well as ramps that were also ADA compliant.

Mr. Healey then opened a discussion regarding the proposed size of the gymnasium, and Mr. Feldman indicated that it was the school's intention to participate in competitive basketball and would need a regulation sized court. He indicated that it was approximately 20-22 ft. from the edge of the court to the interior wall of the gymnasium, with 5 rows of seating on each side to accommodate approximately 320 people to watch that activity. Mr. Feldman then discussed being able to utilize the already existing restroom facilities in the cafeteria for any events in the gymnasium without having anyone go any further into the building.

Ms. Bergailo asked whether the gymnasium could be located in the front of the building, but Mr. Feldman stated that it would be detached from the cafeteria, without the use of the current rest rooms, which would require going through the classroom wings to access it and would not be a practical choice. He added that they would be losing the windows in the front of the building where there would be no light or air circulation. A discussion ensued regarding other possible locations for the gymnasium. Mr. Feldman stated that he could look into the possibility of relocating the gymnasium. He added that the current dimensions of the gymnasium were 94 ft. x 80 ft., with clearance of roughly 3 ft. from the court to the first bleacher. After doing some calculations, Mr. Feldman stated that he would not be able to create a larger gymnasium in the front area of the school either because of space constraints. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Ms. Bergailo inquired about incorporating the gymnasium into the main building that was not part of the school currently. Mr. Feldman indicated that they had looked into that, but the ceiling heights were not tall enough to accommodate a gymnasium there. Ms. Bergailo asked

if there would be outside activities and Mr. Lanfrit said there was nothing planned at this time, but there would be in the future and would be subject to a new application. He stated that they were not proposing a baseball field, and that they do have some outdoor spaces between the two wings of the school as well as an interior space.

Chairman Thomas opened the meeting to the public for questions of the architect.

Mr. Ed Potosnak, 163 Home Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. He indicated that he was President of the Board of Education, but that he was there that evening just as a normal citizen. He wanted to know what safety measures were going to be put in place to protect the children from the activities of the other part of the building. Mr. Lanfrit stated that any use of the other portion of the building would be the subject of a separate development application before the Zoning Board. He added that the testimony of Mr. Feldman indicated that the other portion of the building would be segregated and not accessible to the school. Mr. Lanfrit reiterated that there was no plan in place currently for any outdoor activities, but that they will come forward with another application before the Board once they have an idea of where and what they want to do.

Seeing no one further coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public. Mr. Lanfrit asked for a 5-minute recess, and they will resume the hearing at the conclusion of that break.

At the conclusion of the break, Mr. Lanfrit asked to present the testimony of the Principal and the Traffic Consultant that evening and resume the hearing at the first meeting in January, considering the late hour and that there were only six (6) members of the Board present that evening.

Mr. Namik Serkan, Principal of the Central Jersey College Prep Charter School, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Serkan stated that he became the Principal of the school in August of 2016, but told the Board that he had been a principal since 2005, all with charter schools. He added that the current location of the school is at 17 Schoolhouse Rd., Somerset, NJ and that their charter covers grades Pre-K through 12th grade even though they currently only have Pre-K through 2nd grade and 6th grade through 12th grade. He stated that they would be filling in 3rd grade through 5th grade at the new location and are currently allowed 624 students. Mr. Serkan stated that they have an application before the State, submitted on November 30th, 2016, to be able to take on an additional 624 students within five (5) years. He then indicated that they presently have 70 employees at their current facility, including teachers, aides, staff, and custodians, etc. Mr. Serkan indicated that they have three (3) sending districts, including Franklin Township, North Brunswick and New Brunswick. He then stated that they have approximately 20 students who are driving to school, 11 smaller school busses and the remaining students are brought to school by their parents. He said that the elementary school age students have a separate place for entering/exiting the building at a higher level than high school students, with a total of three (3) entrances/exits to the building. He then testified that the current hours of operation were from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and will be carried over to the new location. He did say, however, that students arrive anywhere from between 7:15 a.m. through 7:50 a.m., with classes starting at 8:20 a.m. and ending at 3:08 p.m., and after school activities going till 4:00 p.m. Mr. Serkan indicated that they have had 100% college admission for the past five (5) years and was the only charter school that achieved the Blue Ribbon Award certification from the State in 2016. Should the charter be granted for the expansion and their enrollment went up to 1,248 students, Mr. Serkan indicated that they would need to

have up to 150 staff members. He indicated that they presently have 20 students who drive to school; and should they receive approval for the new location, they would restrict the number of students who drive to the school to 40 based upon parking allocation. He stated that they would have personnel on-site at the new location, just as they do now, to receive arriving students, both being dropped off by parents near the parking lot entrance and by busses through the cafeteria and/or gymnasium if it continues to stay in its presently planned location. He added that the children exit the building at the end of the day through the same entrance/exit they came in the morning. He then described the types of afterschool activities that occur, i.e. science fair, debate club, etc. and that most children are picked up by parents, but they will have a few late busses to take children home. Mr. Serkan then indicated that they do have a basketball team and a volleyball team, but they do not compete competitively due to the constraints of the present facility. In the new facility, Mr. Serkan stated that they plan to play basketball competitively, with most of the games taking place after 4:00 p.m. when most of the students and faculty would have left the premises so that there would be more parking for the event. He then added that there were some evening events from time to time such as Back To School Night, concerts, etc. approximately once per month. He said they currently stagger events for the different age groups and would continue to do so should they be approved for 1,248 total students so as to have adequate parking. He testified that he felt the total parking allocation at the new facility would still be adequate even if they had 1,248 students.

Mr. Rosenthal asked what percentage of students come from Franklin Township, and Mr. Serkan answered that it was currently at 70% of the total student body and should remain the same as their numbers increase.

Chairman Thomas opened the meeting to the public for questions of Mr. Serkan.

Mr. Ed Potosnak, 163 Home Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. He was interested to know what percentage of the current student population were English learners. Mr. Serkan indicated that it was less than 5%, and Mr. Potosnak indicated that his data showed that it was at 0%. Alternately, Mr. Potosnak stated that the Franklin Township public schools, which have to enroll every child from the Township, had a number of 7% who were English learners. When asked, Mr. Serkan indicated that he believed that there was 7% of the student body who were Special Education students. Mr. Potosnak asked how they accommodated the parking needs at special events such as Back To School Night, and Mr. Serkan reiterated his earlier testimony that they stagger such events by grade level to accommodate the parking accommodations.

Richard Seamon, 30 Rue Chagall, Somerset, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. He noted that he was also a member of the Franklin Township Board of Education, and stated that he was not there that evening in that capacity, but as a citizen of Franklin Township. He had in his possession a copy of the document that was submitted to the State Board of Education for expansion of their Charter, but that it did not detail their 5-year plan to open up the school to 624 additional students. He stated that the document detailed two campuses, one in New Brunswick and one in Somerset, with a 3-year plan (up until 2020) to expand the Somerset location, but not to exceed 930 children. Mr. Bradshaw explained to Mr. Seamon that the Zoning Board gave approvals based upon the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) determined by whether the Applicant puts forth sufficient proofs to warrant the Board to grant that. He went on to state that the Applicant was still subject to every other regulation outside of the Board's

purvue. Mr. Serkan stated that the document only details a 3-year plan, and the 1,248 students testified to during the hearing was based upon a 5-year plan that was not reflected in the document that Mr. Seamon was referring to.

Nancy LaCorte, 6 Blackwells Mills Rd., Somerset, NJ, came forward. She also stated that she was a member of the Franklin Township Board of Education, but was there at the meeting as a concerned citizen and not in the capacity of a Board of Education member. She was interested in knowing how the charter school was funded. Ms. LaCorte was also concerned about the parking during competitive basketball events.

Seeing no one else coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public.

Chairman Thomas also looked at his documentation to discuss a discrepancy in the number of students they were requesting to be approved for at the new location. Mr. Lanfrit explained that there were updates to all reports since the original submission and that all testimony and data presented that evening was based upon the request to have a total of 1,248 students at the proposed school within a 5-year period. Mr. Healey suggested that the Board look at his Planning report, dated November 29, 2016, which he indicated reflected all the updated information for the application. Mr. Dominach added that all of the reviews were based upon the 1,248 number.

Mr. Jay Troutman, Traffic Engineer, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Troutman indicated that his specialty was with schools and that he prepared a Traffic Report for the original plans that were filed and then issued a revised report, dated November 17, 2016, based on the plans that were before the Board that evening. He noted that he reviewed all of the staff comments and were prepared to address each one of them. Mr. Troutman then discussed the access drive from Mettlers Rd., as shown on Exhibit A-1, and determined that it was suitable for the traffic generated by the school, with adequate sight distances. He noted that there were some generous extra paved area and turning radii that were already present on the site due to the previous use that involved trucking. Mr. Troutman stated that the area around Mettlers Rd. was fairly undeveloped and traffic counts were very light. He then discussed how the school's use was compatible with the surrounding traffic, and its hours of peak use were slightly offset from the surrounding uses. He then stated that they were able to work with the Principal and Engineer designing the interior site circulation and signing and designing how the building would intake all of the students. He then testified that the driveway and the parking lot would be able to accommodate the efficient intake of all the users of the school, even after 5 years with full build-out. He testified that all the turning radii on the circular roadway were adequate to accommodate large busses and heard Mr. Stires' testimony that that roadway would be used in a one-way mode that would be appropriately signed. He then discussed the adequacy of the curve in the roadway around the newly proposed gymnasium building and felt it could accommodate the busses, especially because of the width of the roadway and because it would be designated as a one-way road. Mr. Troutman also agreed to work with Township staff to soften that curb to make it even a smoother turn in that location. Based upon how he witnessed the current school operate, he stated that he could testify that the parking lot would be adequate for the uses intended on the proposed site. He also testified that he believed the parking lot would function acceptably during a school athletic event in the proposed gymnasium – not only meeting, but far exceeding what was required in the ordinance. Mr. Troutman added that he also felt that there was adequate parking for any event taking place in the proposed auditorium, but noted that there would need to be staggered scheduling during

larger events to accommodate for the parking demand. Mr. Troutman then discussed how busses park in a queue, noting that they do in fact park end to end and that it was possible to have 26 busses parking around the circular roadway at one time, but probably would not be needed since the busses would not all arrive at the same time. He also testified that he felt it appropriate and adequate to keep separate the busses from the parking lot where parents would be dropping off and picking up and where older students would be entering and leaving the facility in their own vehicles.

Chairman Thomas opened the meeting to the public for questions for the Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Ed Potosnak, 163 Home Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Mr. Potosnak opened a discussion of the need for staggered busing and what the Board can and can't request as it related to parking.

Seeing no one further coming forward, Chairman Thomas closed the meeting to the public.

The Chairman then discussed the continuation of the hearing at the next meeting of January 5, 2016 due to the late hour and the lack of a quorum of Board members that evening.

Mr. Healey opened a discussion regarding the parking needs of athletic events and special events at the school. Mr. Troutman testified that you have to stagger the groups attending as the Principal stated. He then reiterated that the events in the gymnasium as well as in the auditorium would have plenty of parking, but that they just couldn't have the simultaneous scheduling of larger events.

Mr. Ed Potosnak, 163 Home Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward, noting that there was also going to be a Board of Education meeting on January 5th and wondering if the continuation of the hearing could be scheduled for a different date to accommodate the fact that some members may want to attend the hearing as well. Mr. Dominach stated that the continuation date was at the Board's discretion. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they were running on a tight schedule as it was with the timing of permits and being able to retrofit the building in time for next September when the new school year starts.

WORKSESSION/NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business

MEETING ADJOURNED

The meeting was adjourned at 10:21 p.m. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary
January 15, 2017