

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Abel (8:12pm)
M. Augustine
R. DeCroce
D. Haywood
J. Lutz
J. Mathieu
T. Siano
J. Strasser
S. Zdepski
J. Harabedian, Alt. #1
D. Pierce, Attorney
R. Lorentz, Engineer

ABSENT: L. Herrighty, Alt. #2

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by J. Lutz at 8:01 PM.

NOTIFICATION

In order to ensure full public participation at this meeting, all members of this Board, and members of the public are requested to speak only when recognized by the Chair so that there is no simultaneous discussion or over-talk, and further, all persons are requested to utilize the microphones which are provided for your use by the Township. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Notification of the time, date and place of this meeting has been published in the Delaware Valley News and Express Times and sent to the Hunterdon County Democrat, and has been posted in the Kingwood Township Municipal Building at least 48 hours prior to this meeting and has been filed with the Municipal Clerk.

NEW AND PENDING MATTERS

Approval of Minutes

It was moved by D. Haywood, seconded by T. Siano and carried to approve the Minutes of May 9, 2006 and place on file. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

It was moved by J. Mathieu, seconded by D. Haywood and carried to approve the Minutes of the May 9, 2006 Executive Session. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

Smith – Block 37, Lot 9 – Request for Extension of Time

It was moved by S. Zdepski, seconded by D. Haywood and carried to grant a 180 day extension of time to file. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

Trstensky – Block 24, Lot 13.09 & 13.10

It was moved by D. Haywood, seconded by T. Siano and carried to grant the request for extension of time to file. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

Hidden Orchards – Block 22, Lot 16

D. Pierce stated he has reviewed the Affidavit of Notice and publication and the Board may exercise jurisdiction in the matter.

R. Lorentz stated the items found deficient have been supplied, such as the subdivision and boundary adjustments for the adjoining lot to allow access to Hammer Road.

T. Miller, attorney for the applicant, was present for the hearing this evening. The application was approved in March of 2005. The purpose of this hearing is to amend the preliminary subdivision approval due to DEP approval. DEP requires the plan to be modified slightly. There are significant wetlands between Lot 16 and Lot 17. The applicant originally purposed a connector road. The DEP denied the connector road and requested the applicant seek access from another direction. The plan before the Board this evening changes the access point. The other change is, originally there were two detention basins and now there is only one. They will be seeking approval from the DEP on the plan before the Board this evening. The applicant will be adding property to Lot 15.01 from Lot 16.09. The addition of the property to Lot 15.01 will alleviate the need for a variance. The development, as proposed, contains 12 lots.

J. Symonds from Biggs Engineering and J. Cosgrove from TRC/Omni, an Environmental Engineer were present for the application this evening. D. Nenna, applicant, was also present.

J. Abel entered the meeting at 8:12 PM.

D. Pierce swore in J. Symonds.

J. Symonds described the plan before the Board this evening. In the previous plan, access was from Lot 17 across a Category 1 stream. The DEP will not allow the applicant to cross the stream, thereby requiring access from Hammer Road. He described the changes in the plan due to the change in the access. J. Symonds stated the application currently has 13 lots. J. Symonds described the Stormwater Management Plan for the project. The top portion will be going to the wetlands detention and on-site bio-retention basin. The other section uses another type of system. The designs will significantly reduce run-off. The applicant plans a reforestation of the open areas, which is a requirement to reduce the buffer to 150'. They cannot disturb any wooded areas and they had to shorten the cul-de-sac. Any wooded areas in the 300' buffer area cannot be disturbed.

R. Lorentz stated there is an engineering demonstration in calculations that for all storms, the flow from this site will be significantly reduced from what occurs now with the use of the detention basin and other devices. In all but the 100 year storm, there will be virtually no flow from the detention basin. The County has reviewed the subdivision and given their approval. There is a situation where the water flow from the property has been reduced by taking a significant amount to the other side of the property and treating it through bio-retention facilities. He has not heard from the County that they wish to have the culvert replaced.

After more detailed review of the plat, the Board members felt the applicant should return with all sheets of the plat in agreement.

D. Pierce swore in J. Cosgrove.

J. Cosgrove, Environmental Engineer and professional engineer, employed by TRC based in Princeton, New Jersey. He has experience in Stormwater management issues. He has lectured on the subject of Stormwater management regulations and has testified before other boards.

The Board accepted his credentials.

J. Cosgrove testified rather than using a conventional detention basin and collecting the water and diverting it to one centralized area, they will be picking up the Stormwater runoff as quickly as they can along both sides of the road. They propose a bio-retention swale, long and narrow. The runoff from the road flows into the swale, consisting of a sandy media for a few feet and below that gravel. It is designed so that the 2, 10 or 100 year storm infiltrate into the swale. The swale will blend into the lawn. They took tests with the lowest permeability and used half the rate in designing the infiltration through the soils. They had a 2" per hour infiltration rate. The media they will be utilizing is very sandy. They have to make sure there is enough organic so that plants will grow. It will be a mix of 15% peat moss. They have used the system throughout the state and it has worked well. The swales are designed so they are above the seasonal high water table in the area. The detention basin was designed to have 6" of water in some areas and more in others. As a result of an inquiry by the Board member, he stated he would be willing to plot the soil tests in the area with their results. He does not envision any of the water running down the swale. The water will go into the soil zone and will infiltrate through the gravel. With the type of grade change on the property, there will be no issue of the water surfacing. They are required to reduce the peak flows as part of the regulations. The sandy soil will be above the seasonal high water table with the gravel possibly into the water table. Fabric will be placed between the sandy mix and gravel. The system requires very little maintenance. The homeowner must be informed not to fill in the swale. The water going through 2' of sand will be very heavily treated. On the ones indicated on the plat, the runoff from the roofs will be going into an infiltration trench on the lot. Driveway runoff goes into the swale. On a Category 1 stream and buffer, there is a 300' special water resource treatment area. The 300' buffer can be reduced to 150' if there is existing disturbance, such as agriculture use. Today, there is a cornfield currently existing and going to within 5 feet of the stream, there is a 300' buffer that can be brought down to 150'. The area cannot be utilized. When the buffer is reduced, the Stormwater treatment has to be upgraded to remove 95% of total suspended solids. In response to the Board's concern of people parking over the swale, he responded there are two alternatives. The project could be designed with Belgian block curbs without mortar or solid curbs with curb cuts, allowing the water into the swales. It is environmentally sensitive to not use curbs. The swale could be moved further into the front lawn. R. Lorentz responded possibly setting it back another two feet.

J. Lutz called for comments from the public.

T. Hauck inquired about how the system would affect potholes in the road. J. Cosgrove responded they should be not affected.

J. MacConnell – Spring Hill Road – commented on the high water table.

S. McNichol – commented on the high water table and the freezing of the ground with a crash melt. There would be problems with drainage and things backing up. How is this system going to prevent those problems? J. Cosgrove responded he has installed these systems in Readington Township and with really cold temperatures and a quick thaw, with the soils being more clay than sandy, are draining very nice in those conditions.

In response to S. McNichol's comments on the acreage and septic designs, D. Nenna responded the lot contains 74 acres and J. Symonds stated the septic systems will be bed type, mounded. In response to her inquiry as to the size of the homes, D. Nenna responded a minimum of 3,000 sq. feet. J. Symonds stated the smallest lot is 2 acres.

J. Lutz inquired if the Board would like to request the applicant to move the swale back 2'. The majority of the Board was in favor of moving the swale the two feet.

J. Lutz adjourned the hearing to July 11, 2006 without further notification.

CORRESPONDENCE

J. Lutz reviewed as per the agenda.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

T. Hauck - Water Well Coordinator – in contact with P. Althoff with the progress with the Water Well Ordinance. There will be a draft to the Subcommittee by the middle of July. He will distribute it to the Subcommittee and all other interested parties

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by J. Mathieu, seconded by J. Strasser and carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 PM. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Laudenschick, Secretary