

WESTAMPTON TOWNSHIP LAND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

NOVEMBER 5, 2014 7:00 P.M.

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Westampton Township Land Development Board was held at the Municipal Building on Rancocas Road on November 5, 2014 at 7:00 P.M. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ron Applegate and the opening statement required by Sunshine Law was read. This meeting was advertised in the Burlington County Times on January 3, 2014 and posted in the Municipal Building. All guests were welcomed.

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call: Present: Mr. Attaway, Mr. Blair, Mr. Borger, Ms. Chang, Ms. Coe, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Maybury, Chairman Applegate, Mr. Attaway, Solicitor Jesse Debrosse, Engineer Greg Valesi, Planner Harry McVey, Secretary Marion Karp
Absent: Mr. Carugno, Mr. Williams

The minutes of the October 1, 2014 meeting were approved as written.

Resolutions:

20-2014 UHS of Hampton, Inc., d/b/a Hampton Behavioral Health Center, Block 202, Lot 4.01 – preliminary and final major site plan (addition) was memorialized

21-2014 2367 Kuser Road, LLC, Block 1411, Lot 21 (895 Rancocas Road) – use variance for church - continuation of application until 12/3/14 meeting – was memorialized

New Business:

Ingerman Development Co., Block 401, Lots 2 & 8 – preliminary major site plan approval (affordable rental apartments, 72 units. Peter Wolfson, attorney was present on behalf of the application. The property is situated along Woodlane Road. Thomas Fick, engineer, James Haley, architect, and Maurice Rached, traffic engineer were all sworn in before the Board by Solicitor Jesse Debrosse. They were all accepted as expert witnesses.

The plan was modified and reconfigured so that the parking spaces do not intrude into the buffer.

Mr. Fick reviewed the existing conditions on the site. The entrance to the site is approximately across from Stemmers Lane and is primarily wooded. A tributary of Mill

Creek runs through the property. An LOI was obtained and a 50 foot transition area was identified. A riparian buffer will be required also; there are some flood hazard areas on the property. They do not anticipate any encroachments into the wetlands. The plan is in conformance with the Redevelopment Plan and as a result there are new design criteria for the property that include recreational facilities and buffering, amongst others. There are two design waivers from the RSIS being requested which will be identified later in the meeting.

Six apartment buildings are being proposed. Each building has 12 units for a total of 72 units. There will be 40 two bedroom units, 18 three bedroom units and 22 one bedroom units. The access to the project was determined by the County. There are 123 parking spaces proposed; a community building and a tot lot. Parking spaces were adjusted in accordance with the Planners report; therefore, a variance is no longer necessary. There are two detention basins for storm water management. There are sidewalks throughout the property and a sidewalk will be installed along the frontage on Woodlane Road. The project will be serviced by public water and sewer. The two RSIS design waivers are for a 75 centerline radius instead of a 100 foot radius as far as the road servicing the development. The applicants feel it is a roadway that is functional and that can accommodate fire apparatus. The location of the driveway created a difficulty making the alignment work, hence the need for a design waiver. The wetlands transition area and the adjoining lot 7 also contributed to this. They have used a radius such as this on other projects that have functioned successfully. Circulation through the site will be adequate. RSIS requires 143 spaces and they are proposing 123 spaces. Generally speaking, the residents should have one car for most units and the parking should be sufficient.

There is an emergency access drive that will be constructed according to fire standards. There is significant landscape buffering along the adjoining residential lots. Retaining walls are proposed along the rear of the site due to the grading adjustment to the rear of the site (north side). LED lighting is planned along the pedestrian walkways, which is glare reducing. In some of the transition areas buffer averaging is necessary. The applicants will work with DEP on these. There is a project sign at the entrance to the site.

The community center will contain a rental office, and some open space, such as for use for birthday parties.

The Planners memo was reviewed by the applicants. They will provide fencing detail as requested by Harry McVey. They are working with the MUA to determine what their requirements are for the pump station; details will be submitted prior to final approval. Sidewalk along the frontage will be coordinated with the County and constructed as per their standards. They agree to all conditions in the memo. Harry wants to see a bus stop with a bench installed along Woodlane Road, similar to what was required at Project Freedom. The applicants agree to work with the County on approvals for the bus stop.

The engineers' report was reviewed. The applicant agrees to work out any technical details with the engineer and believe they can address all comments. Signage will be installed to identify the conservation areas; they don't want to install fences here as it will be cost prohibitive. There is no requirement as per the ordinance for fencing. Greg Valesi stated that since this is a planned development he doesn't see a problem using only signage. If it was a single family development, those tend to claim a portion of these lands as their own. He is okay with the signage from an engineering standpoint.

The applicants stated that they will comply with all the comments in the Fire Official's report.

A traffic analysis has been prepared for the project. A trip generation analysis was conducted; the A.M. peak is expected to have 31 outgoing and 8 incoming trips; 37 incoming and 20 outgoing trips in the evening are expected. They came up with a very good level of service for the driveway, C or better for outgoing traffic and A level for incoming traffic. Evening outgoing traffic is C level and incoming traffic is level A. They looked at safety and visibility for the access with the County engineer when visiting the site. 600 feet is required for sight distance at the entrance; much more than that is provided. They conducted fire truck circulation simulations and found that it is adequate. The boulevard itself is a great safety feature. Based on Mr. Rached's studies, 1.2 or 1.1 parking spaces per unit is adequate, they are providing 1.7 spaces per unit based on our ordinance. A traffic light at the entrance is not warranted, according to the County. Gene Blair asked what the distance was from the crest of the hill to the development entrance; the traffic engineer did not know but stated it was more than 600 feet. They made a guesstimate and came up with approximately 700 feet.

A handicapped space will be located adjacent to the community center and they will be seeking Title 39 enforcement as well.

James Haley, architect, reviewed the architectural plans with the Board. The buildings will have breezeway entrances; brick, lap siding and aluminum trim work and architectural shingles. He reviewed floor plans; all ground floor units are fully handicapped accessible or else adaptable. They are three story apartment buildings. The upper level units all have private balconies. There will be a full time maintenance person on site. The buildings are wrapped with a base of brick which extends up the middle. Clapboard siding is on the middle of the buildings; the applicants agree to add more color to the facades as per the Board's recommendations. There are no proposed elevators. Each apartment unit will have their own washers and dryers.

A brick entrance/identification sign is proposed; and will be lit. Shed details were reviewed; it will be located near the pump house. Lara Schwager was sworn in before the Board; snow removal will be handled privately. Trash pickup will be private and may be reimbursed through the Township.

A full time management person will be on site in the community building. The community building will be fully sprinklered, as will each apartment building. It will

house a warming kitchen and rest rooms as well as a management office. It is sized for approximately 40 occupants and is 1954 square feet in size. It will have 7 parking spaces. The outside will be brick and clapboard to match the apartment buildings. There are energy star lighting and appliances in each apartment. The tot lot is adjacent to Building 1. They distributed a packet detailing the tot lot to the Board. It was suggested by Ms. Chang to change the fencing from a metal picket to something less dangerous since children are known to climb fencing. The applicants agree to provide a metal top rail on the fence.

There are fire sprinkler rooms on the side of each building. The fire department connection will be brought out of the front of the buildings. The breezeways are open; nothing will be permitted to be stored here. Management would be responsible for enforcing this. The wrap around porch on the community building could serve as a bus stop for children. Ingerman will meet with the school board and work out the details as to what will be the safest way and location to pick up the children for school.

The applicants prefer not to provide sidewalk access to the front of the center units due to engineering concerns; Greg Valesi concurs and doesn't have a problem with this.

Two trash/recycling areas are planned; they work with a private hauler to design these areas. They will be handicapped accessible. Pick up frequency will be worked out between Ingerman and the hauler.

They conducted a Phase 1 and a limited Phase 2 environmental study on the site, according to Lara Schwager. They found barrels that were rotted; as well as a small area of pesticide which will be removed. A small section at the front of the site has been designated as historic fill. An LSRP will be hired to handle the remediation. There is nothing that indicated anything ongoing will be taking place at the site, according to Greg Valesi.

Ingerman will maintain the storm water management basins; their maintenance people will be taking care of them. They will have a discussion with the MUA to allow for connections to sewer for the four adjoining lots along Woodlane Road. Ingerman has more than 7000 units in Pennsylvania, NJ, Delaware and Maryland. They are long term holders of their properties and ensure the properties are maintained and kept up.

Mr. Freeman asked what is provided as far as recreation for older children; Lara Schwager explained that it depends upon the final placement of the fire access lane and other things but they will provide an open green space for passive recreation. There is a community in Medford and Manalapan and they are building one in Burlington City as well.

There will be ceramic tile in the bathrooms, vinyl plank laminate in the kitchen, carpet in the living room, dining room and bedrooms. The units will have a high occupancy rate; they will run anywhere from \$300 dollars a month to about a \$1000 a month for rents. 30%, 50% and 60% of median income is how the rental amounts are calculated.

Gene Blair would like to see the four lots be given a chance to tie into water; Mrs. Schwager explained that water is being brought into the back of the community and stub ins will probably not occur. Water service will be looped between Stemmer's Lane and where they will bring it in on the other side, if they can get an easement from the property owner on Lot 6.

At this point, the meeting was opened to the public for comment.

Nancy Burkley asked how many students will be brought in for this project. An analysis was done early on. Lara doesn't remember the number. She asked about assessment for taxes and if the fact this is low income would affect the tax that is collected and will the taxes be enough to cover school, police, EMS and other services. This is done through a PILOT agreement; 100% of the taxes go to the municipality according to Ms. Schwager. There is nothing going to the school nor the County. This is more money than the municipality would get under a normal breakdown. Ms. Burkley asked if the renters will be signing a code of conduct. In the leases there are rules and regulations and a management group that oversees the properties. She also wanted to know why all the low income units are all in one spot and not spread out. The tax credits are paying for this project, there is no cost to the Township since it is 100% affordable housing, it has to be this way, according to Ms. Schwager. She asked what Ingerman gets out of low cost housing and why they are doing this. Lara stated that they build both affordable and market rate units, it is their model for the company, they have been doing it for more than 20 years. If you build with tax credits, the affordable units must be all on one property. There are rules and regulations in all the leases and the management group would be overseeing things to make sure it is an orderly community.

Steve Boonstra asked what time of day the traffic assessment was done. Morning counts were performed from 7 AM to 9 AM and 4 PM to 6 PM in the afternoon. The traffic engineer stated that these were the highest traffic counts of the day. Mr. Boonstra is concerned by the bridge where Irick Road and Woodlane Road meet and the increase in traffic; he thinks the Committee should look at this and consider a light at this location. The traffic engineer explained that the counts aren't close to the thresholds necessary to need a light. It was explained to him that the County would determine if a light needed to be installed here since it is a County road.

Joann Bowen of 92 Winstead Drive asked how far a distance the development was from her house. It is well over 1,000 feet away. She asked if Woodlane Road was going to be enlarged to add a left hand turn lane; they were not sure yet, it depended on the County.

John Mumbower, 29 Lancaster Drive asked about the number of bedroom units and what the square footage was. Master bedrooms would be about 150 square feet and additional bedrooms would be about 100 square feet. He asked how many people they estimated would be living in a unit. You can have a maximum of two children per

bedroom; with a three bedroom, you could have a maximum of six persons living there.

Molly Boonstra, 613 David Street is concerned about Block 401, Lot 7. Lara Schwager stated that the property is under contract for purchase by Ingerman. She asked about where the PILOT money is going and who is going to pay for these new students and said there isn't enough money in the school system now. Board Chairman Ron Applegate stated that this is not a question for this Board; it is a policy question that needs to be brought to the Township Committee.

Janet Curran asked how many acres of wetlands are in the parcel. Most of the parcel consists of wetlands. She said they are putting these residents in jeopardy; she thinks the Board should consider the amount of wetlands especially with residents and children moving in. We are losing open space rapidly in Westampton; she isn't against affordable housing. She is worried about what will happen in years to come. She uses the road everyday and sees how bad the traffic is. It is a bad location for affordable housing.

Dave Barger, 212 Olive Street asked why this is a 100% affordable housing project. Planner Harry McVey answered that the Township is under pressure to provide more affordable units. If there is an inclusionary development to get the same number of credits, we would need 480 units, which would surely impact the school system. It is also financed through tax credits so there is nothing that the Township has to contribute through an affordable housing trust fund. In order to qualify for these tax credits, you have to meet very specific site criteria according to Lara Schwager. This site has been a designated affordable housing site long before Harry came along. David Barger commented that almost all of the existing affordable housing stock is within about a quarter mile of each other. He thinks we are loading up on affordable housing in one area which represents a lack of diversity and that the housing should be more evenly distributed throughout the Township. He asked if there was any expansion planned for this project. He thinks there are better examples of apartments than what is planned. He thinks they look very 1970s and is not happy with the design.

Alison Barger, 212 Olive Street commented regarding parking; she isn't sure there is enough parking.

John Mumbower – asked about how the units are rented. He asked if sublets would be permitted; they would not be. He asked if Lara had any statistics regarding how well their developments were managed.

There being no further public comments; the meeting was closed to the public. Mayor Chang made a motion to approve the application; the motion was seconded by Mr. Freeman. All Board members voted yes.

Public Hearing, Master Plan Amendments – Housing Element & Fair Share Plan, Open Space, Recreation & Farmland Preservation Plan, Population & Housing

Trends. There are some minor variations to be made to the Housing Element and Open Space Elements. The Woodmont site needs to be added to the plan as well as the Ingerman Development. Some statistics in the plan need to be updated as well. We will be required to do a new Housing Plan within 6 months of when the new COAH rules are adopted, according to Harry McVey. We have made progress towards satisfying our obligation and have consistently tried. This holds a lot of weight with the courts. He is estimating approximately 300 units of affordable housing as our new obligation. There is not enough land in the existing plan to accommodate that many units. Project Freedom needs to be adjusted down from 72 units to 48 units.

The Open Space plan needs to be adjusted by taking the Hogan Farm out, which has since been sold to Virtua. We need to add the lot by the Timbuctoo area as a possible acquisition. The Township owned Project Freedom lot needs to be removed from the plan as well.

This was opened to the public for comment. Nancy Burkley asked that if the more affordable housing we build the more we will be required to build. Harry answered yes and no and explained it.

John Mumbower – asked if the 28 low and moderate units in the Woodmont Development would be subject to a PILOT program. Harry McVey said he didn't know and that this question should be directed to the Township Committee.

There being no further comment from the public, the meeting was closed. Ms. Coe made a motion to approve the Master Plan Amendments; the motion was seconded by Mr. Blair. All Board members voted yes.

The meeting was opened again to the public; Nancy Burkley commented that it was extremely hard getting a parking place at this evening's meeting and if the Board could see if the cheerleaders could have their meeting at the school instead. Ron Applegate answered that this is not something that is up to the Board; he apologized for her difficulty.

Comments from the Board:

Ron Applegate commented that he grew up in a row home, in a socioeconomic situation that afforded him the opportunity to be where he is now and he thinks it is disrespectful to use low and moderate housing as a scare tactic.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Marion Karp, Secretary
Westampton Township Land Development Board

