

TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN
PLANNING BOARD
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY

REGULAR MEETING
July 16, 2014

The regular meeting of the Township of Franklin Planning Board was held at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey and was called to order by Chairman Orsini at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read, the Pledge of Allegiance said and the roll was taken as follows:

PRESENT: Councilman Chase, Robert LaCorte, Cecile MacIvor, Robert Mettler, James Pettit, Carl Hauck, Charles Onyejiaka and Chairman Orsini

ABSENT: Robert Thomas and Edward Potosnak

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Martin Murphy, Board Attorney, Mr. Mark Healey, Director of Planning and Vincent Dominach, Senior Zoning Officer

MINUTES:

- **Regular Meeting – June 18, 2014**

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

FOR: Vice Chair MacIvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Pettit, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Onyejiaka and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

RESOLUTIONS:

- **JaxGennaro, LLC / PLN-14-00014**

Mr. LaCorte made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. LaCorte, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Pettit, Mr. Hauck and Mr. Onyejiaka

AGAINST: None

DISCUSSION:

Vouchers:

- **Martin Murphy – July Retainers - \$833.00**

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Vouchers as submitted. Mr. LaCorte seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. LaCorte, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Pettit, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Onyejiaka and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

HEARINGS:

- **COUNTY OF SOMERSET / PLN-14-00008**

Mr. Francis P. Linnus, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, County Of Somerset. Mr. Linnus explained that they were before the Board that evening for a Hardship Variance w/Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision in which the Applicant was proposing to divide a 7-acre property into two lots at 140 Old Georgetown Road, Princeton; Block 9, Lot 47, in the RR-5 Zone.

Mr. Linnus indicated that the purpose of the subdivision was to preserve the rear 5 acres. He added that the front two acres would contain the existing single family home and that the County would like to use the preserved space as open, passive space and part of the County's 95-acre South Franklin Initiative, an area targeted to preserve the environmental and scenic integrity of Millstone River Valley. Mr. Linnus included that the proposal intended to leave the 5-acres in its natural state and in the future, develop a trail network connecting other County Open Space properties.

Mr. Linnus explained that there was one variance required with the sub-division from the minimum lot area requirement for proposed Lot 47.26 (containing the existing home) as there was a 5-acre minimum required in the RR-5 Zone. He also discussed the fact that the Application technically qualified as a major sub-division as the site was previously subdivided within the last 10 years. Mr. Linnus went on to explain that there was no new construction or development proposed.

Mr. Linnus then discussed the staff reports, noting that Mr. Healey's Planning report gave opinions on the variance which the Applicant agreed with. He then indicated that it was a class c-2 variance case for lot area and served a number of purposes, including the appropriate and efficient expenditure of public funds to coordinate public development with land use policies. He added that they were in agreement with the Township Planner and don't see any detriments whatsoever since the home on proposed Lot 47.26 was already existing and there was no development planned. He added that the remaining lot size was similar in size and dimension to the other lots along adjoining Stephen Drive.

Mr. Linnus then discussed Mr. Scott Thomas, Township Engineer's report, stating that they would be able to comply with all comments in the report.

Mr. Linnus then discussed the subdivision, marking as Exhibit A-1, a rendered copy of the subdivision. He went on to describe the elements of the subdivision. He then noted that the subdivision was adjacent to existing County property consisting of 6 acres and would ultimately merge with additional County open space. Mr. Linnus then entered into the record as Exhibit A-2, a more graphic rendering of the subdivision and overall County Open Space, stretching from Canal Road down to Old Georgetown Road.

Mr. Pettit opened a discussion regarding the existing septic field and its proximity to the new property line. Mr. Pettit noted that there was a requirement that there be at least 10 ft. between the property line and the septic field.

Mr. Tom Boccino, Principal Planner of Land Acquisitions for Somerset County, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Boccino indicated that they could go back and speak to their consultant and have him confirm the distance. He added that if it was confirmed to be closer than the required 10 ft., they would move the property line to accommodate that. Mr. Linnus added that they would agree to this as a condition of any approval.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Seeing no one come forward, the Vice Chair then made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Application and Mr. Pettit seconded the motion. The roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. LaCorte, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Pettit, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Onyejiaka and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

- **SOMERSET FIRE & RESCUE CO., #1, INC. / PLN-14-00007**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Somerset, Fire & Rescue Co., #1, Inc. Mr. Lanfrit explained that the Application before the Board that evening was for a Site Plan in which the Applicant was proposing to construct a pole barn and add parking at 20 Hollywood Avenue, Somerset; Block 444, Lot 1.01, in the R-20 Zone.

The following variances were required, per Mr. Healey's Planning Report:

1. Front Yard Setback: 35 ft. required – 34.7 ft. existing (existing building setback on Hollywood Avenue).
2. Maximum Building Coverage: 15% permitted – 15.4% existing/19.4% proposed.
3. Maximum Impervious Coverage: 25% permitted – 77.2% existing/77.9% proposed.
4. Section 112-87: 6 ft. high screening required – existing fence is 5 ft. tall.
5. Section 112-88: parking lot drive aisle width shall be 26 ft. wide – 24 ft. proposed.
6. No lighting in rear gravel area to be used for parking (lighting of parking facilities required).
7. Parking areas required to be paved – Phase I plan involves use of gravel parking area.

Mr. Lanfrit indicated that the Application was a phased project, beginning with Phase I, to include the construction of a pole barn adjacent and behind the existing fire house on the subject property. He added that Phase II would include the paving of a graveled area that was occasionally being used as overflow parking to make it a formal parking lot.

Mr. Anthony Pancheri, Fire Chief of Somerset Fire & Rescue Co., and Charles Maria, Trustee of the Somerset Fire & Rescue Co., came forward and were sworn in.

Mr. Maria then discussed the project, detailing the two proposed phases. He indicated that they were proposing the construction of a pole barn because they will be in receipt shortly of a new fire truck that would be slightly too large to fit in the current building. He testified that they would be moving some of their equipment to the proposed pole barn to accommodate the larger fire truck. He then testified that they would be storing mostly

trailers that house specific equipment and two boat trailers as well as the tow vehicle (a 15 passenger van). Mr. Maria then entered into the record as Exhibit A-1, which showed the exterior of a brochure from Pioneer Pole Buildings, Inc., who would be supplying the pole barn. He noted the pole barn pictured on the back of the brochure that they were proposing. Mr. Maria also showed some material samples, indicating they would be utilizing the light tan color for the exterior, brownish color for the trim and dark brown for the roof of the proposed pole barn. He passed the samples to the Board members for their review. Mr. Maria then indicated that the pole barn would include heat, electricity and water as he stated that they were required to maintain 55 degrees in the building by the district that owned the equipment that would be stored there. He then testified that they would be bringing the utilities to the proposed pole barn from the existing building, which was only 10 feet away. He then described how the two ceiling mounted heaters would be vented, stating that the exhaust would go through the side walls instead of through the roof.

Mr. Maria then discussed the use of the gravel area to the rear of the property, stating that it was used less than a dozen times a year. He described some events that take place, notably their Public Safety Day Event in October. Mr. Maria then discussed the use of the building for rentals for groups during the year and their parking needs. He did add that there was an occupancy load of 120 people for the building which would restrict the number of cars parking there. He then indicated that they would have to do some fundraising in order to pay for the paving of the gravel area, which was why it was placed into Phase II of the project. He indicated that it might take as long as 10 years to raise the required funds.

In reviewing the staff reports, Mr. Maria agreed that they were in general agreement with the comments made in those reports.

Mr. Pettit opened a discussion regarding how the parking spaces were delineated on the gravel area presently.

Mr. LaCorte raised the question about how many parking spaces would be lost to the placement of the pole barn. Mr. Maria indicated that they would lose less than 10 parking spaces with the construction of the pole barn. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Chairman Orsini then raised the question as to whether they were in perpetual violation of the zoning ordinance by using the gravel area for parking when it needed to be paved to do so. Mr. Lanfrit stated that it was a pre-existing condition that had been there since the inception of the fire company. A discussion ensued regarding the gravel area's use for parking.

Mr. Michael K. Ford, Engineer employed with Van Cleef Engineering, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Ford then described the existing conditions on the property, describing the open chain link fencing surrounding the property. He then described the lighting on the property as including building

mounted lighting as well as four free-standing lights in the existing paved portion of the parking area. He stated that after the pole barn was constructed, the property would be able to accommodate 29 paved parking spaces and about 29 parking spaces within the gravel area. Mr. Ford then discussed what would occur on the property during Phase I, including the placement of a 50 ft. x 40 ft. pole barn directly behind the existing building along with grading for the pole barn and to improve the access to the rear gravel parking area. He indicated that a detached storage shed and a timber retaining wall were located there presently and would be removed. He then described Phase II to include the improvement of the existing gravel parking area to the rear of the property, which would also involve the re-grading of the area. Mr. Ford also added that there was a proposed lighting plan for the newly paved parking area to include a light pole to be placed at the center of that newly paved parking area as well as the replacement of the existing light poles located in the presently paved parking lot with more efficient fixtures. He added that it would allow for the use of only two fixtures, thereby eliminating one light pole. He also stated that the replacement of these fixtures would allow the fire company to eliminate the rental fee to PSE&G that they were presently paying by having their own private fixtures. Mr. Ford told the Board that the new fixtures would comply with the Township standards to avoid light spillage onto adjoining properties and would be appropriately screened and shielded. He noted that the light poles were proposed to be 20 ft. high, including fixtures. In response to the Chairman's questioning regarding the possibility of lowering the light poles, Mr. Ford indicated that they would then probably have to include an additional light pole to ensure proper lighting. The discussion then continued regarding landscape screening, which would also be expensive.

The Chairman noted the positives for having private light poles, presuming it would also allow the fire company the ability to turn them on and off when the building was in use. Mr. Ford indicated that the light fixtures presently are on dawn to dusk, but that they could look into lowering the height of the proposed new light poles. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that the rear parking lot light would not be lit every night and only utilized when there were events there in the evening, which were limited.

Vice Chair MacIvor inquired as to what type of landscaping they were planning on utilizing. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that Mr. Healey's recommendation was to include slats in the fence and some evergreen screening and deciduous trees, which they will work out.

Mr. Ford then identified, for the record, the variances that were listed in Mr. Healey's Planning report. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that some were existing conditions, with one an exacerbation of an existing condition. In speaking of the request for relief for the increased width of the parking lot drive aisle, Mr. Ford stated that they plan to continue the existing condition of 24 ft. when the gravel parking area gets paved. He added that there was no ability to widen the drive aisle in the existing paved parking lot and that they would lose parking spaces in the gravel area to accommodate that requirement. He noted that since there was no parking lot lighting presently in the gravel parking area, they were seeking relief to provide that lighting in Phase I, but would do so in Phase II when the gravel area was paved. He added that they were also seeking relief

of having to pave the gravel parking area in Phase I and wanted to be allowed to wait to do so during Phase II. He also indicated that they were seeking relief of having to curb the parking area when it was paved.

Mr. Ford then testified that he had reviewed all the staff reports and would be able to comply with all comments or work out any issues with the Township Engineering Dept.

Chairman Orsini then questioned item #14 in the Township Engineer's report regarding the provision of a storm-water management system required with the creation of 1,000 square feet or more of new impervious area. Mr. Ford indicated that they would comply and would discuss the details with the Township Engineering Dept. A discussion ensued regarding the storm water runoff issue and Mr. Ford testified that even after all the work was completed, the water runoff would still drain to Hollywood Avenue and not impact the surrounding residential properties.

Mr. Mettler inquired as to whether they had made application to the D&R Canal Commission as yet and Mr. Ford indicated that they had, but had not received a report from them, to date.

Chairman Orsini opened the discussion on how to provide for the appropriate screening and still allow the Applicant to maintain their 5 ft. fence by utilizing slats in the fence and mandating a landscaping plan to supplement during Phase II along the rear and Easton Avenue side of the property line to screen residential properties. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Vice Chair MacIvor made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Ms. Mary Clinton, 1370 Easton Avenue, Somerset, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. Ms. Clinton was concerned about the effect of construction on her well that is near the property line with the firehouse property line. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that when the developer subdivided and sold the property to Ms. Clinton, there was a stipulation that the home would be connected to public water, which was available. He indicated that there was a water line access easement in place that goes out to Easton Avenue that was created as part of the sub-division to benefit Ms. Clinton's lot. Mr. Lanfrit also stated that Ms. Clinton's well would not be impacted by Phase I of the construction, but would be when they get to Phase II. A discussion ensued and Ms. Clinton was advised to look into the matter further prior to Phase II.

Rev. Dr. Pierce, 7 Hollywood Avenue, Somerset, NJ 08873, came forward and was sworn in. Rev. Dr. Pierce was concerned about how the new, larger truck would impact her property since she lived across the street and there had been times when they needed to drive over the front of her property to access the building with the fire trucks. Mr. Maria indicated that the newer truck would not have the same issues as the older truck and that the driver's were cognizant of keeping the truck off of her property.

Seeing no one further coming forward, Mr. Mettler made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Site Plan and Variances with all the conditions discussed during the hearing. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. LaCorte, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Pettit, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Onyejiaka and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

- **FUSION ON ICE, LLC / PLN-14-00003**

Mr. Steven Azzolini, Esq., Attorney and Principal of Azzolini & Benedetti, LLC, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Fusion On Ice, LLC. Mr. Azzolini indicated that the Application being heard that evening was for a Site Plan w/Variances in which the Applicant was proposing an addition to their existing building at 15 Worlds Fair Drive, Somerset; Block 468.09, Lot 62.02, in the M-2 Zone.

Mr. Dominach's Zoning report indicated that the Applicant was proposing an addition to their existing indoor hockey rink (ProTech Hockey Ponds) to provide for two NHL sized hockey rinks instead of one NHL sized rink and two smaller rinks. He noted that the following variances were required:

1. Rear yard setback to residential: 100 ft. minimum, 51.82 ft. proposed
2. Parking: 328 parking spaces required; 157 proposed.
3. Parking in front yard is proposed and not permitted.
4. Buffer to stream corridor: 300 ft. minimum, 58.52 ft. (building), 51 ft. (parking lot) proposed.
5. Sign setback: 20 ft. minimum, 3.28 ft. proposed.

Mr. Azzolini then gave the Board and public a brief synopsis of why they were there that evening. He indicated that they were there that evening for an Amended Preliminary Site Plan approval for the purposes of constructing an extension to the currently existing facility. He added that the plan was to add an additional full size rink and remove the two smaller rinks. Mr. Azzolini indicated that the Applicant had discovered over the past 7 years of operation, that to serve the public adequately, they would need another full-size rink. He stated that it would enable them to have more learn to skate programs for figure skating, more programs for non-profit organizations such as the Girl Scouts, Homeschoolers, etc., along with the hockey teams that use the facility currently.

Mr. Lawrence Murphy, Engineer and Principal of Wyssling Consulting, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Murphy then entered into the record as Exhibit A-1, an aerial exhibit illustrating the surrounding properties and

dated 7/15/2014. Mr. Murphy explained that the proposal intends to expand the building by 9,700 sq. ft. He also stated that the Application proposes to relocate the existing parking lot to the northern property line. He noted that the parking spaces would be increased from 136 to 157 spaces, relocating the existing ProTech Hockey sign closer to Worlds Fair Drive and at the same time decreasing the size of it from 96 sq. ft. to 64 sq. ft. Mr. Murphy then testified that no access drives will be altered and the circulation for the site would not change. He added that they would still have a double row of parking spaces along all three sides of the building. Mr. Murphy then explained that the present above-ground storm-water management system would be placed underground and would meet all requirements of the NJDEP as well as Township standards for water quality and storm-water management. He then indicated that recharge was not required. He then discussed the lighting, noting that adequate lighting would be put throughout the site along with landscaping. Mr. Murphy explained that the sign was being moved closer to Worlds Fair Drive to maintain visibility from traffic coming from Rte. 287. He did state that there were other signs along Worlds Fair Drive that were placed similarly and would not be out of character for the roadway.

Mr. Murphy then went on to discuss the variance requested for rear yard setback to a residential property, noting that there was a significant distance and a substantial amount of trees separating the properties. He also added that the proposed addition would be partially screened by the existing building. He then addressed the variance requested for parking in the front yard, noting that 50% of the other buildings along Worlds Fair Drive have parking in the front yard. Mr. Murphy also stated that there was presently parking in the front yard of the ProTech Hockey building and that they were just extending that parking area.

Chairman Orsini pointed out to the Board the fact that some of the variances were already granted in the original plan. Mr. Healey brought up the fact that the Parking in Front Yard variance was being exacerbated by requesting only a 2 ft. setback that would not allow for landscape material to be planted. Mr. Healey asked the Applicant to provide enough setback to allow for an area of landscaping. Mr. Murphy testified that Worlds Fair Drive curves in on the property, shrinking the amount of space they have. He said that he didn't want to decrease the size of the drive aisles from 26 ft. wide to something smaller, make the parking spaces smaller, or eliminate some parking spaces to accommodate for space to provide landscaping. As an alternative, he suggested that they could put some vertical grasses or a landscape wall in that space instead of shrubs, which would not fit there. They agreed to a condition of any approval to place appropriately sized landscape material in that space. He then drew the Board's attention to the Buffer to stream corridor variance, noting that they had been in contact with the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission (DRCC). He discussed the DRCC's stream corridor ordinance and the conversation they had with them stating that the stream on the property did not qualify as a stream because it had a drainage area less than 50 acres and also did not have a discernible channel within it. Mr. Murphy added that NJDEP also did not deem it qualified as a stream, but because it was on the FEMA map, the Township deemed it a stream. He then spoke of drainage direction, stating that the water goes to Worlds Fair Drive and not towards the stream. A discussion

ensued among the Board. Mr. Murphy indicated that the drainage area on the property had decreased since the original approval in 2004/2005 due to the various projects built around the area since then where the drainage was captured in storm water management systems. Mr. Murphy testified that they had provided the documentation from the DRCC, who issued a report. He noted that the proposed addition would not increase the minimum buffer and, therefore, would not increase the variance.

Mr. Murphy then stated that he had the opportunity to review the Township Engineer report and had no objections to any of the comments.

Mr. Glen Denischevsky, V.P. of Operations for Rink Management Services, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Denischevsky described for the Board the services their company provided for ProTech Hockey Ponds. He then spoke of the discussions that occurred with the owners regarding the effect the proposed changes would have on the programs offered and the day to day operations. He explained that even though they were planning on adding more square footage to the building, they would be going from three rinks to two rinks, allowing for more flexibility for scheduling and programming, which he stated was the key in alleviating any undue pressure on the parking area. Mr. Denischevsky indicated that they would be implementing some changes, including not allowing buses on-site, but dropping off and then leaving the facility to return to a designated parking area at a designated time. He then spoke of staggering of programs and also informing groups of when they should arrive at the facility to make sure the flow works with other groups coming to the facility. Mr. Denischevsky then spoke of the preparations they make for weather fluctuations and the plans made with outside vendors to move snow and lay salt to keep the parking area clear and usable 100% of the time.

The Chairman asked Mr. Azzolini to focus the discussion on the comments in Mr. Healey's Planning report regarding parking issues and to speak about the possibility of shared parking.

Mr. Azzolini then spoke about the Parking Letter Report, noting that it was done in March of 2014, two months before Mr. Denischevsky and Rink Management Services came in to manage the operations of the facility. He noted that the Shared Parking Agreement did not meet with the criteria of the Zoning Ordinance, but that they quickly realized that with the reduction of one rink and the plans that Mr. Denischevsky and his group plan to implement, they would not need a Shared Parking Agreement. Mr. Healey then asked for more quantitative information regarding how many people and how many teams would be using the facilities and how that related to the 157 proposed parking spaces. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. John Harder, Traffic Engineer employed with Atlantic Traffic & Design Engineers, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Harder discussed the report he prepared as well as the current numbers that were experienced currently at the facility. He indicated that he could not utilize the numbers projected for ice skating rinks (40 spaces) from the ITE as they were projecting usage for a figure

skating facility and not a hockey facility, which was not realistic for the types of events that were held during the year at ProTech Hockey Ponds. He also explained how the changes from three rinks to two rinks would affect the parking situation. Mr. Harder testified that they focused the study on two major events that occurred in February and March of this year, tallying the number of cars at the site for the largest event of the year in March at 147 vehicles, both on the site as well as those off-site. He noted that there were 31 parked vehicles off-site because of the snow conditions, utilizing the parking lots of the light industrial building across the street. Mr. Harder stated that they have agreed to a condition of any approval for immediate snow removal to allow for 100% parking availability moving forward. He also noted in the report that they witnessed buses parking in the parking spaces during the evening tournament and agree, as a condition of any approval, to make sure that buses drop off and pick up only on the site without taking any parking spaces on-site.

Mr. Dominach questioned how the parking would not be impacted further now that they were proposing two larger rinks instead of only the one they had before. Mr. Harder indicated that during the last big event in March of 2014, they were not only utilizing the larger rink, but also the two smaller rinks during the tournament. Mr. Harder also explained that they needed the larger rinks for figure skating, Learn to Skate and Learn to Play Hockey programs and were not looking to expand tournament play. He clarified for Mr. Dominach and the Board that there would only be two games playing at one time with the two large rinks as opposed to three games playing at once with the three rinks. He also mentioned controlling the flow of people to and from the site by staggering games will also greatly reduce the need for additional parking spaces. Mr. Harder testified that they did not hold adult hockey tournaments, so there would be minimal use of the showers during tournaments and that most people exit the facility after their game is over because of the long time frames between their games. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Denischevsky indicated that his company operated other facilities with two large rinks, noting that some had 157 parking spaces and others had a slightly higher number. To answer Mr. Dominach's question regarding how the sites were operating, Mr. Denischevsky testified that he has not had any complaints about the parking and that the other facilities ran similar events as ProTech Hockey Ponds does, sometimes with more large events per year. He then discussed the number of people who would utilize the facility for open figure skating, noting that the parking is much less impacted with that activity as opposed to hockey games and tournaments. He also reiterated the use of planning and programming so as not to create bottlenecks with the movement of people within the facility.

Mr. Dominach asked whether they would agree to a condition that they wouldn't have two hockey games starting at the same exact time and Mr. Denischevsky answered in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Maclvor voiced her concerns regarding parents/siblings staying at the facility during games, which would then impact parking. She especially pointed out families

coming from longer distances as those who might do so and she asked Mr. Murphy, the project's engineer, if he considered putting a second deck above the lower parking area. Mr. Murphy stated that they didn't consider that because they didn't feel there was a need for it. He also added that there would not be a substantial increase in parking by doing so because you would lose lower parking spaces to the required ramps up and down from the upper level. Mr. Murphy felt there would be a drastic improvement in the availability of parking spaces due to the implementation of all of the items discussed previously during the hearing, including snow removal, busses not allowed to park on-site, scheduling and planning, etc.

A Board member inquired about where busses would park during games if they were not allowed to park on-site. Mr. Harder indicated that they would either go to a satellite site provided by the bus companies or to other areas of the Township until the designated time for pick-up.

Mr. Denischevsky testified that they wouldn't plan on having more than three hockey tournaments per year as any more would interfere with their in-house figure skating and Learn to Skate programs, which was the focus of the proposed expansion.

Mr. Healey asked whether there would be any other large events, perhaps for the figure skating program, where the demand for parking would be high. Mr. Denischevsky answered in the negative. The discussion then moved on to the number of teams attending hockey tournaments at their facility. Mr. Denischevsky indicated that there would be a maximum of 24 teams over the course of 3-4 days. He then indicated that there would be four teams at any one time at the facility, with a total of around 8-10 games in one day. A discussion ensued. Mr. Denischevsky spoke of roughly 100 cars coming to the facility at any one time.

Mr. Azzolini indicated that they still have the Shared Parking Letter with Homewood Suites for out of area patrons to stay at their facility and utilize their parking; however, they were not relying upon the shared parking with the proposal before the Board that evening.

The Chairman then discussed the Fire Prevention report and the Applicant agreed to comply with all comments.

Mr. Mettler made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Vice Chair MacIvor seconded the motion and all were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, Mr. Mettler made a motion to close the meeting to the public and the Vice Chair seconded the motion. All were in favor.

A motion was made to approve the Application, with Variances. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. LaCorte, Vice Chair MacIvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Onyejiaka and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: Mr. Pettit and Mr. Hauck

WORKSESSION/NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Dominach announced that there would not be a meeting in August.

ADJOURNMENT:

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to adjourn the regular meeting at 10:30 p.m.
Chairman Orsini seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary
August 18, 2014