

**MINUTES  
PLANNING BOARD  
TOWNSHIP OF CHATHAM  
August 15, 2016**

Mr. Thomas Franko called the meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:30 P.M.

**Adequate notice** of the meetings of the Planning Board of the Township of Chatham was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act as follows: Notice in the form of a Resolution setting forth the schedule of meetings for the year 2016 and January, 2017 was published in the *Chatham Courier* and the *Morris County Daily Record*, a copy was filed with the Municipal Clerk and a copy was placed on the bulletin board in the main hallway of the Municipal Building.

**Roll Call**

Answering present to the roll call were Mr. Franko, Mr. Hurring, Mrs. Swartz, Mr. Brower, Ms. Hagner, Mr. Travisano and Mr. Nelson. Mr. Ciccarone, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Murray were absent.

Also present were Township Engineer John Ruschke and Amanda C. Wolfe, Esq.

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Brower requested clarification on a sentence about rebar anchors in the minutes. The sentence was amended.

Ms. Hagner moved to approve the minutes of the July 25, 2016 meeting as amended. Mr. Travisano seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Hearing**

**Plan: 16-9-1 (March 21, 2016) Longview at Chatham, LLC, Longview Ave, Block 9, Lots 1 & 1.01, Block 32 Lot 2, Block 33 Lots 1, 1.01, 1.02, 14, 14.01, 17 & 20. Variance relief from certain conditions contained in June 4, 2012 Prior Planning Board Approval and Engineering conditions detailed in review dated January 29, 2016.**

Mr. Schaffer distributed a redline draft of the resolution which also included some comments from Mr. Ruschke. The document was entered into the record as Exhibit A-18. The consensus of the Board was to have a high level review of the proposed changes.

Mr. Ruschke noted that the draft resolution refers to the retaining wall which has been rectified. Ms. Wolfe said that although the variance is no longer requested, it is customary to include such a reference in the resolution because the variance had originally appeared in the application.

Ms. Hagner noted that the draft resolution indicates that Mr. Ciccarone recused himself from this application, and she said that Mr. Sullivan has also recused himself.

Mr. Ruschke offered clarification on a field change for the relocation of a driveway.

Mr. Ruschke commented on paragraph 18, and said that there is a comment regarding snow removal attributed to both himself and Mr. Moschello. He said that the comment should only be attributed to Mr. Moschello.

Mr. Ruschke challenged the assertion that Mrs. Mahle-Greco testified that GeoWeb is a better solution than ShoreTec for the steep slope. He agreed that GeoWeb is an alternative, but disagreed that ShoreTec is inferior. Mrs. Mahle-Greco said that GeoWeb is a better solution for this particular site.

Mr. Ruschke commented on a passage which states that the final CO will not be issued until all the conditions of the Board have been met. He said that the language is vague, and should specify which Board requirements are being referenced. Ms. Wolfe said that the language was referring to the landscaping plan.

Mr. Ruschke addressed a section of the resolution regarding the stability of the detention basin. He also asked about the installation of a rough liner and the GeoGrid.

Regarding the GeoWeb on the Mountainside Drive slope, Mr. Ruschke noted that while most would be on land maintained by the homeowner's association, a portion would be on private property. He suggested that an easement be included for the maintenance of the GeoWeb.

As a general comment, Mr. Ruschke said that the resolution should refer to the Township Engineer rather than the Township Engineering Department.

Mr. Ruschke addressed street trees, and suggested that they all be planted in the fall of 2016.

Mr. Brower asked about a gap in the guide rail. Mr. Ruschke said that the approved plan already includes a fence to address that issue, and openings in the guard rail by the detention basin will need to be addressed.

Mr. Ruschke addressed landscaping improvements in the steep slope areas, and that no improvements in the steep slope area would be permitted without Board approval. Mrs. Swartz asked if language should be included regarding sprinklers and irrigation.

Mr. Ruschke also addressed a condition regarding field calculations. He said that the calculations have not yet been resolved.

Ms. Hagner asked about the timeframes referenced in condition 15, and suggested that the condition should include the dates by which the particular elements of the work are to be completed.

Mr. Ruschke said that monuments and street lighting should be installed prior to any CO's being issued.

Ms. Hagner asked about a preconstruction meeting referenced in condition 20.

Mr. Ruschke said that the final two CO's should not be issued until maintenance issues have been resolved.

Mr. Ruschke also addressed the need for an updated developer's agreement prior to the issuance of building permits. Mr. Schaffer said that the Township Attorney has approved updated language for the developer's agreement subject to the Planning Board's approval of the application.

Mr. Ruschke asked that a condition be added that any improvements or repairs to be made in the roadway shall be completed prior to any CO's being issued.

Mr. Ruschke asked about bifurcating the resolution to deal with the detention basin separately.

The Board was polled to ascertain if Board members want to wait for the final resolution to be prepared before voting, or if they want to vote at this meeting on the concept. The consensus was to wait for the final draft of the resolution. Ms. Wolfe said that the Board can vote on the application and vote to memorialize the resolution at the same meeting.

### **Discussion**

Mr. Brower commented on a pending application for installation of generators at the Rose Valle Condominiums, and asked if the applicant is aware that the Board of Health regulates noise. Mr. LaConte said that the matter has not been brought before the Board of Health. He noted that while the Board of Health regulates noise, they do not have any jurisdiction over the placement of the generators. Mr. Ruschke also said that the State has exemptions for emergency generators.

Ms. Hagner moved to adjourn at 9:16 PM. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

---

Gregory J. LaConte  
Planning Board Recording Secretary