

WORKSHOP MEETING OF THE TOWNSHIP OF
PARSIPPANY-TROY HILLS PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY APRIL 9, 2007 @ 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Parikh called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Members Present: Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Banks, Ms. Bronfman,
Mr. Corcoran, Ms. Elbin, Councilwoman Grossi,
Mr. Keller, Mayor Luther (7:08pm), Chairman Parikh

Also Present: Paul Cappetta, Municipal Engineer;
Edward Snieckus, Burgis Associates;
John J. Montefusco Esq. Planning Board Attorney

Absent: Mr. Burns, Mr. Purzycki

Announcement is made that adequate notice of this meeting has been given that it is being conducted in accordance with N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 et seq. of the New Jersey "Open Public Meetings Act".

The meeting is opened to the General Public. There was no one in the public wishing to speak.

Ms. Baldwin made a motion to approve the minutes of January 22, 2007. Seconded by Mr. Keller. Ayes: Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Banks, Ms. Bronfman, Mr. Corcoran, Councilwoman Grossi, Mr. Keller, Chairman Parikh.

Ms. Baldwin made a motion to approve the resolution granting Final Site Plan approval to AMT, LLC, Block: 735.02 Lot: 2, Application #07:503. Seconded by Mr. Keller. Ayes: Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Banks, Mr. Corcoran, Ms. Elbin, Councilwoman Grossi, Mr. Keller, Chairman Parikh.

Ms. Baldwin made a motion to approve the resolution granting Amended Preliminary Approval to Lor-Gene, LLC, Block: 767 Lot: 31, 939 Edwards Road, Application #04:521 and 04:18. Seconded by Mr. Keller. Ayes: Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Banks, Ms. Bronfman, Mr. Corcoran, Councilwoman Grossi, Mr. Keller, Chairman Parikh.

The first item on the agenda is the Zoning Amendment Recommendations regarding Single Family Bulk Criteria, Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Analysis. Mr. Snieckus said the last discussion the Board had was on commercial properties and what the FAR should be or what the Board should consider. The Board asked what the implications are. He said he had noted that the question is not just the size of a building but the amount of parking on a site to support the building.

He had started with calculations of the B-3, the O-3 and the SED-5 as examples of the FAR implications. He prepared examples for the O-3 and SED-5 tonight. The B-3 showed that with a 20,000 sq. ft. lot it was difficult to get over a .15 FAR in the zone because of the requirements for parking.

Mr. Snieckus discussed the sheet labeled F.A.R. Analysis – O-3 Zone Existing Zoning Layout #1 (attached). What it shows on the left is a conceptual site plan of what a conforming lot could have, regarding the building mass and parking lot size. The building shown is a three story building. In effect there is an FAR of .4.

Page 2 (Layout #2) shows what could be done with underground parking which increases the FAR to .48 and the building size 10,000 sq. ft. larger. In this zone he had recommended a .4 FAR in that zone. There is only one building that exceeds a .3 FAR in the O-3 zone, the Hundal building on Rt. 46 which is at .33.

Mr. Snieckus explained that right now the cost of underground parking is very high, but he was trying to project into the future. Parsippany is such a desirable area for development he thought the Board should be prepared for more creative methods of construction.

He tested the same scenario in the SED-5 (illustration attached). Mr. Corcoran asked if the property would not have to have the correct slope to build like this without extreme excavation. Mr. Snieckus reviewed the SED-5 examples. The first example shows a 95,000 sq. ft. building with a .44 FAR. That is a massive building. Currently the SED-5 allows a .35 building coverage so the inferred FAR is 1.05 which is three stories at the 35% building coverage. That would require a substantial parking garage. The next illustration shows the maximum size with a building garage allowing up to a .7 FAR. An example is the SJP building on Interpace Pky. This shows how an FAR could control the ultimate density in a zone and the bulk of a building.

There were no questions from the Board. Mr. Snieckus said he feels this shows the need for some type of FAR on the larger lots. He sees the need more for re-development. The next step is for the Board to discuss it, or he can come back with a proposed recommendation. This would be for the O-3 and SED-3 zones in particular. In the B-3 zones the lot sizes are not conducive to over building.

Chairman Parikh asked the Board if it should ask Mr. Snieckus to prepare the recommendations. Mr. Keller asked if there were any examples for re-development with parking in front or lots that could be re-developed in that way. Mr. Snieckus noted he was not aware of any, and the current cost of decked parking seems to be about \$15,000 per space. He suggested that parking garages could be regulated as accessory structures, so not in the front and regarding set-backs etc. Mr. Snieckus will come back with a memorandum including both residential and commercial recommendations.

The next item on the agenda is the Municipal Storm Water Management Plan. Paul Cappetta from the Engineering Department is covering for Mike Pucilowski. Mr. Cappetta said Mr. Pucilowski is hoping to have the plan approved by the Board at the next meeting, so he is here to review it.

The introduction explains what is covered by the plan and the strategy. It covers and plan that disturbs more than one acre. The purpose of the plan is to develop a strategy for the storm water impacts as required by state regs. It includes build out analysis ordinances and mitigation strategy. The goals are stated in the plan.

The storm water discussion covers the hydrologic cycle where run-off comes from to stream or recharge, where it goes. Run off is basically from impervious areas. The plan includes population growth calculations and defines the two basic watersheds in Parsippany, the Rockaway River Watershed and Whippany River Watershed. Parsippany also has nine sub-watersheds identified on a map. The map also shows soil types, ground water recharge area and the wellhead protection areas.

The AMNET (Ambient Biomonitoring Network) measures the biological habitation deterioration of the streams and rivers in the Township.

The report goes into design and performance standards. The goals are to minimize adverse impact of Storm Water run-off on water quality and quantity of ground water recharge in receiving water bodies.

Plan Consistency states the plan has to be consistent with other plans in place including the Residential Storm Water Management Plan and the Township Stormwater Control Ordinance. The Highlands Council Standards and the RSIS must be consistent also.

Non-Structural Stormwater Management Strategies include have low impact development to preserve the hydrology flows were before construction. This section includes the NJDEP Development rules. It also lists Township Ordinances to be revised.

There is also a section on Land Use Build-Out Analysis. This is for land development for pollutant loadings from impervious areas. There are steps to go through in this analysis.

The items of concern for water pollution include total suspended solids including silt, decaying plants and animal matter, industrial waste and sewage. These are caused primarily soil erosion from construction. Phosphorous is another concern. Remedies include pet waste control, disposal ordinance, and control of fertilizers.

Ms. Baldwin asked about the build out analysis and are we at the maximum allowable. Mr. Cappetta said that is in the appendix. It shows that we are not

built-out. Mr. Snieckus said this looks at all open space regardless of and constraints on the property.

The last section is the Mitigation Plan. The purpose is when you can't meet a performance standard it offsets the effective requirements the Township can approve a mitigation project. The applicant assures the maintenance. Specific mitigation projects include retro-fits to an existing system or new projects to provide control.

Sensitive receptors for storm water include trout associates waters, lakes and ponds. Other areas are culverts and property subject to flooding. Mitigation projects can be for storm water quality, storm water quantity and ground water recharge.

Storm Water quality is achieved by directing run-off to the natural area for infiltration into the ground water. Mitigation for storm water quality exists at locations for additional storage or a slower release of storm water by increasing ponding areas and other steps.

Mr. Corcoran asked about the quality of our storm water. Mr. Cappetta said he does not know the Township well enough to make that comparison. There is a section of the report that states the levels of pollutants and how we score.

Ground Water recharge can be done two ways to maintain the groundwater hydrology of a project area.

Selection requirements for mitigation projects include being in the same area, legal authorization and having no impacts on other properties. The requirements for Mitigation Projects include the impact for non-compliance and a narrative and supporting information. Mr. Snieckus said that these requirements have to be addressed by an applicant to a board and be met as mitigating factors arise.

Chairman Parikh clarified that it is like the Well Head Protection. The applicant gives all the data and the professionals make sure it follows all the requirements, the same as for the storm water management. The Engineer will verify the data. It becomes part of the checklist. This could become a limiting factor in development, if the property can not have the percolation rates or they can't find some off tract project for mitigation they would not be able to develop or the project scaled down.

Mr. Cappetta said the report submitted must identify receptors, provide drawings, identify who will do the work and maintenance. They must also provide all local and state permits. The mitigation must take place while the construction project is being done, and no Certificate of Occupancy can be issued until the Mitigation Project is complete.

One option for mitigation is funding of other projects with certain conditions as listed.

Mr. Corcoran asked if the County will require specific areas to be mitigated have to be identified. Mr. Cappetta said he believes it is submitted as is. It becomes an element of the Master Plan as required by the state. It can stand by itself for now as an element of the Master Plan.

There were no further questions from the Board. The Board will vote on the plan at the next meeting, next week. Mr. Keller asked if the recent re-classification of the Rockaway River will have any impact. Mr. Cappetta did not know and Mr. Snieckus said that would probably have more impact on wetlands. The impact is more upstream than Parsippany, but the decision was for the entire river.

Mr. Arthur Henderson, 65 Leamore Drive offered some comments about the river question.

Chairman Parikh said next week is the official public meeting for the vote on the plan.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.