

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

The regular meeting of the Newton Planning Board took place on the above date. Vice-Chairman Marion read the Open Public Meetings Act and requested Mrs. Citterbart to call the roll. Katherine Citterbart, Board Secretary, stated there was a quorum.

FLAG SALUTE

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mrs. Mattingly, Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Marion, Mr. Tharp, Mr. Elvidge, Mr. Ricciardo, Mr. Russo, Ms. Logan, Mr. Hardmeyer, Mr. Steinberg

EXCUSED: Ms. Gill, Mr. Le Frois

PROFESSIONALS PRESENT: David Soloway, Esq. of Vogel, Chait, Collins & Schneider; Jessica Caldwell, PP, of J. Caldwell & Associates, David B. Simmons of Harold Pellow & Associates.

BOARD SECRETARY: Katherine Citterbart

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting May 21, 2014

Mr. Flaherty made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Logan seconded the motion.

AYE: Mrs. Mattingly, Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Tharp, Ms. Logan, Mr. Hardmeyer, Mr. Steinberg, Vice-Chairman Marion

HISTORIC RESOLUTIONS

None

RESOLUTIONS

None

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

**Katherine Member (#FMJSK-02-2014)
Block 14.04, Lot 30.01 & 30.02
65 & 67 Madison Street
T3 Zone**

Applicant is requesting final major subdivision for two lots.

Alyse Hubbard Esq. representing Katherine Member.

SWORN: Gary L. Worley, 21 Ashford Street, Newton, NJ, previously accepted by the Board as surveying the prior application.

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Ms. Hubbard stated: Ms. Member is here for final major subdivision. The applicant inherited two developed pieces of property from Charlotte Huff, 65 and 67 Madison Street. They were conveyed to her by separate deeds that were accepted by the County but once submitted to the Town it was realized that the lots had merged so subdivision was required. There is still an ordinance that has triggered a major subdivision due to the variances that already existed on the property. In January of this year she received preliminary major subdivision approval, the resolution was adopted in February. She is now here for final. We understand there is an ordinance that will go into effect on July 2, 2014 that would make her application a minor subdivision and Ms. Member would like to go forward as a major subdivision at this time. This lot once subdivided is already under contract to sell 65 Madison Street, Lot 30.01 (potentially). We have contacted the title company and because the deeds are already recorded in their minds Ms. Member is already the owner, we are moving forward with all documents having Ms. Member appear on them so you will see easements that already say her name as the owner although your tax records indicate that Charlotte Huff although deceased is still the owner of the property. In the title company's opinion once this application is approved will perfect that subdivision once the map is filed and hopefully clean up the mess up of the title that exists on this property. I think the best thing to do right now is look at the resolution of approval from February, 2014 and go through the conditions and see if the conditions have been satisfied.

Ms. Hubbard stated: Going over the resolution, the first conditions references all the language in the resolution. The second condition of the approval was a common driveway easement that was submitted for approval by your professionals. The main comments of that easement and a comment you will see throughout the application is that one of the lots is referred to 30.01 and 30 and they want them to be 30.01 and 30.02. That will be something that we have to address in everyone's report throughout. Otherwise I did not receive any comments on the common driveway easement.

Mr. Soloway stated: Drafts of those were previously provided to Mr. Simmons in May. I don't think Mr. Simmons got the Metes and Bounds description which you would have to review but I approved the form of the agreement subject to clarification as to the who the grantor should be. That is what Ms. Hubbard was referring to earlier. She did provide me with a copy of the Title Report. I was not aware that Ms. Huff was deceased and title has been conveyed to Ms. Member and I essentially told Ms. Hubbard I thought it should be from Ms. Member but the title company for the buyer of the lot should make the final determination as to how it should be for title purposes and I understand that that's what they determined so I am fine with it, subject to Metes & Bounds review.

Ms. Hubbard stated: I think Metes and Bounds was submitted with the Technical Review Committee and I can get you additional copies but it will have the wrong tax lot.

Mr. Soloway stated: Those should go to Mr. Simmons.

Ms. Hubbard stated: The condition 3 is to prepare a proposed subdivision map. This was submitted last week.

Mr. Worlery stated: This map conforms to the approved preliminary map. If you remember there was a question about the sewer lateral tie ins and those were tested by the Town's public works and it was discovered that they do share a tie in that comes off the street and then branches off on 65 Madison Street's property. The easement has been continued and it confirms with what I thought that they do share a lateral. I have to change the lot numbers and address some of the notes that Mr. Simmons put on there but I think it agrees with the preliminary map.

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Ms. Hubbard continued: Condition 4 requires the dye test be performed and that an easement be drafted and that was submitted. The description of those easements and the property in general has been submitted to Mr. Simmons for review. Condition 5 is the tax numbers for the proposed lots are to be approved. That approval is attached to the application and that is what references Lot 30 should be referred to Lot 30.02. Condition 6, all taxes, fees, assessments and escrows shall be due and paid in full within 20 days. To my understanding that has been done. I do not have documentation providing that but my understanding is that it has been completed. Condition 7, the applicant shall obtain approval from other governmental agencies. The only other agency that was required was Sussex County Planning Board and the application was submitted to them earlier this month. We received a letter that the application was deemed complete and a hearing is scheduled for July 7, 2014 at 9:00AM that was copied to the Board and the County Engineer and Ms. Member. Condition 8 that the applicant shall comply with all rules, regulations, statutes and ordinances.

Ms. Hubbard stated: We have received the report from Mr. Simmons and based on that report the application was deemed complete. There are some issues for the final plat as Mr. Worley referenced. They are some minor things. With regards to the Easement and Maintenance Agreement for the sewer lateral, the words appliances and pertinences have been changed, regarding the parking, it is a duplex so four spots are required and the garage and there should be a space for other two parking spots.

Mr. Worley stated: The preliminary proposed graveling area for two-car parking. The parking spots are there, they are grass now but the applicant needs to put gravel down.

Ms. Hubbard continued: Condition 5, lot numbers change, Condition 6 Sussex County Planning approval is required. The other report we have is from Ms. Caldwell and her only comment was that the lot needs to be change.

Mr. Hardmeyer asked: Why does the County need to be involved.

Mr. Soloway stated: Because it is a major subdivision, they are required to file with the County Planning Board. The County's jurisdiction is tied into applicants on County Roads and the impact an application has on County drainage.

Mr. Simmons stated: I feel the applicant has addressed all the comments in my report of June 17, 2014. The only thing I would like to add as I was following the testimony given, as far as the time frame, my assumption is that they would have to have the monuments placed before the maps filed and the notes changed and gravel parking area constructed before the maps are filed. The monuments are property markers. They are required because it is a major subdivision on the out bounds. I am just waiting for some signature for the signature blocks. I am satisfied with how Mr. Worley has drawn up the easement. I discussed the entire sanitary sewer laterals with Paul Baldwin and I am satisfied.

Vice-Chairman Marion opened this portion up to the public.

With no public coming forward, this portion is closed.

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Mr. Ricciardo made a motion to approve the final site plan going into effect pending receipt of all the information that Mr. Simmons mentioned in his report that has not been filed yet. Mr. Flaherty seconded motion.

AYE: Mrs. Mattingly, Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Tharp, Mr. Elvidge, Mr. Ricciardo, Mr. Russo, Ms. Logan, Mrs. Hardmeyer, Vice-Chairman Marion

Resolution #108-2014- "Resolution of the Town of Newton, in the County of Sussex, New Jersey, directing the Town Planning Board to review a proposed Amendment to the Hicks Avenue Redevelopment Plan pursuant to the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law"

Mr. Flaherty recused himself.

Ms. Caldwell stated: This plan was referred to the Planning Board to review for consistency with the Master Plan but we are also open to other comments and ideas to send back to the Town Council. The Hicks Avenue Redevelopment plan is on the Newco Site the original vision for the development was to have a mix-used building along the frontage of Sparta Avenue, an apartment structure, adjacent to that and then townhouses on the remainder of the property that had rear access alley ways to garages behind. In talking to some potential redevelopers we have been asked to consider some other design options. We have looked at it with the thought process that if those redevelopers don't come to fruition that other ones will be able to step in. We also took the opportunity to clean up some items while we have the amendment in play that we thought would benefit development and create a greater potential for it to be redeveloped. In terms of the overall development plan, in the residential area we have increased residential area; we increased the density from 15 units to 20 units per net acre. If that sounds high it is because it is a net acre calculation so there is quite a bit of wet lands adjacent to the property and there is a 100 foot buffer from those wetlands so a lot of development area is taken out of play. I think for the Newco site alone you are talking about maybe 70 units for townships. We also added two building types. Instead of having mixed-uses along Sparta Avenue, we gave the potential to have a commercial building, either single use or multi-use but commercial without the apartments over or office over. We added a building type for townhouses that can be accessed from garages in the front along with some architectural suggestions in that area as well as bulk standards for that. We revisited the storm water. There was a mandatory gray water recapture program on a lot of the redevelopment areas due to some issues with the town's overall water allocation. The Town has done an excellent job in leak recovery and fixing leaks throughout the system most particularly under Fox Hollow Lake and the water usage has gone down enough where we think that could be an optional plan where gray water could be reutilized at the option of the developer rather than a mandatory program. There are some other small clean up items. We did add single family as an option so if some of the single family lots remain single family, they would be able to rebuild or reconstruct their homes if there was some kind of fire and they are able to redevelop their property if they don't become part of a larger development scheme. In terms of affordable housing, that remains. We did have a 20 percent set aside on the prior plan, under proposed regulations for COAH that has been reduced to 10 percent. We have also added some options of building those units off site or having a payment incur. That summarizes the major changes to the plan.

Mr. Marion asked: Is the old train bed between Sparta Avenue and the property?

Ms. Caldwell stated: Yes, they have a requirement to maintain a bike path through the property. It does need to stay in the same place but we do want to continue the bike path through the property. The Town owns the property so they would have to work with the

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

developer. The developer would either purchase or somehow otherwise allow the town to use that property.

Mr. Hardmeyer asked: How many of the Board members have seen the original redevelopment plan?

Mr. Marion stated: I don't remember.

Mr. Hardmeyer stated: Asking the Board members to approve amendments to something they have not seen. I think it would be nice to have that to refer to and then we will know what is being amended. On the original one there is a road going out to Sparta Avenue, correct?

Ms. Caldwell stated: Yes, that would be permitted subject to County approval since it is a County road.

Ms. Caldwell stated: I didn't mention it but we did add in some variations to the circulation plan because it might be unrealistic as you are suggesting. It is very close to the intersections. I think we will need a light at that intersection. It would be difficult to have a boulevard coming out at that point. I am thinking there would be an access from Hicks Avenue.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: We are talking about a Redevelopment Plan that is conceptual at this point. Any developer who is going to go in there is going to have to present the plan before the Planning Board to have it approved. At that point in time you will have to say how many entrances and exits you want.

Mr. Hardmeyer stated: We went through this at Patterson Avenue; would we be wise to include that?

Ms. Caldwell stated: We have not had any interest in that. Since we have had interest in the residential we are trying to go forward with that.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: I know you are aware that Water and Sewer did an excellent job in finding 20 percent of the 35 percent lost water but the Town had them do that because we are encouraging redevelopment and revitalization. We only have so much water allocated to us. We brought the recovery as a mandatory item as a way to conserve water. Even though we have recovered 20 percent of the 300,000 something gallons that was lost every day, we are looking for more redevelopment and residential units, I still think it should be mandatory and not optional. That is the way we proposed it that is the way the governing body wanted it for all those years. We did not spend all the money to recover the water to give it away.

Mr. Russo stated: I respectfully disagree with the Mayor. I believe we made other accommodations with other redevelopments in town and we want to be realistic about redevelopment going forward. We need to make that type of arrangement optional.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: I really think it is important to conserve as much water as we possibly can.

Ms. Caldwell stated: I will leave it up to the Board and the Council as a policy decision.

Mr. Hardmeyer asked: Does anyone know how much we use as to what the sustainable yield is out of the reservoir.

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Mr. Simmons stated: We are shooting for 1.5 million and our allocation is 1.1 million.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: We were billing for 638,000 gallons a day so way along the way more than 300,000 gallons was lost through leaks and it was that way for years. It was unconscionable whoever was in charge of water and sewer knew that and never brought it to anyone's attention and never did anything to correct it. Ms. Millikin and Mr. Baldwin did a phenomenal job to recapture a lot of that water and it was because we needed the water to allocate for redevelopment. I think recapturing it is a good program.

Mr. Russo asked: How does the plan and amendment deal with the issue of the driveways, concrete, asphalt?

Ms. Caldwell stated: The one thing we changed was the original plan required stamped concrete which would be something that looks like pavers or pavers. I changed it to straight concrete. I think there had been some comments from some people that potentially allowing asphalt would be a good option. We are trying to make it so development costs are realistic given the housing market.

Mr. Russo asked: Migrating from standard concrete to concrete should we not also include the option of asphalt?

Ms. Caldwell stated: I do not see an issue with that.

Mr. Ricciardo asked: Are we talking about a townhouse complex where there is going to be row housing and we are going to give them the option of standard concrete in their driveway or one driveway with stamped concrete, one driveway with plain concrete, one driveway with asphalt?

Ms. Caldwell stated: No, it would be a uniform development.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: That is fine with me. I don't have a problem with anything you mentioned except for the recapture.

Ms. Caldwell explained water recovery. She stated: The idea is that rain water would be captured on the site and reused. You would have cisterns or you would have some kind of underground tank to capture water falling on the roofs and going through gutters. That water would be recycled to use for gray water purposes which is not drinking water. It could be used for flushing toilets, washing cars, landscaping.

Mr. Hardmeyer asked: They would have to build a basin or some type of storm water management system, right?

Ms. Caldwell stated: I am not sure about that. There is a lot of impervious on the site already so depending on how that calculates out they may or may not have to.

Mr. Marion asked: Is this the only site we are proposing water recovery? I don't think I have ever heard of other lots or developments have this?

Ms. Caldwell stated: We had it in the Thorlabs plan but we did take it out. They thought it was cost prohibitive to do.

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Mr. Ricciardo stated: They also made concessions with the types of fixtures they used with eliminated the flow of potable water through their toilets and other systems.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Marion opened up this portion of the meeting to the public.

1st Public

Neil Flaherty, 154 Sparta Avenue, Newton, asked: How many buildable acres are there for that 13.65?

Ms. Caldwell stated: I think around 6 or 7 acres.

Mr. Flaherty stated: Right now under this proposal we are allowing 20 units per buildable acre, correct? In the original plan they mentioned they were allowing 15 dwelling units per net or approximately 90 units of combinations of townhouse and such. Are we increasing the density by this plan? It is increasing it to 120 units.

Mr. Soloway stated: For the whole areas it is increasing to 120 units. It is going from 90 to 120 units.

Ms. Caldwell stated: You are limited by the amount of space you have. They can only put so many units in there.

Mr. Flaherty stated: I am trying to avoid having all apartments which would be permissible according to this and have that many units leaving units within it. Because of the existing traffic and this would be adding to it. I don't think it is in keeping with the Master Plan or Smart Growth to put in a higher density.

Ms. Caldwell stated: If that is a concern, I did create a new land use plan and we could limit apartments from this area.

Mr. Flaherty asked: You said it could fluxuate 50 feet from one to the other, would that be detrimental in that smaller strip. Will it inhibit parking?

Ms. Caldwell stated: It could be permissible that their parking could be in that area.

Mr. Flaherty stated: Which again would reduce open space for residents which is not smart planning.

Ms. Caldwell stated: Again, anything would come with a site plan. We cannot foresee everything single thing that could possibly happen.

Mr. Flaherty stated: My concern is increasing the density by a 1/3 and the maximum density is not clear on this and adding that many vehicles is not a good idea. It is not in keeping with the residential neighborhoods that surround it. That is a major concern. It really hovers around the density. If you look at Patterson it is 6 per acre and if you look at Martarano it was 5 per acre and our standard of 9,000 sq. feet per lot is really less than 5 per acre. This is far in excess of any other area in the town. It is going to present problems. I am saying I don't think the density should increase, I think it is already excessive.

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Ms. Caldwell stated: It is a little difficult because we went back and forth in doing this plan in doing the net density vs. gross and when you think about it if you have 6 buildable acres of 13 and you are using net it really is 50 percent less so it really is 10 units per acre because you are taking out all of this area that normally under all of the other types of plans we look at the density is a gross calculation. I left it as it because there have been so many calculations on the property already but it is a little misleading because it does cut the density in half by 50 percent so it is an inflated number in terms of what it really is.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: The buildable acre will reduce the 6.5 to maybe 3.5 and that would limit the number of units that could be developed on that site whether they be apartments, townhouses or mix uses. It says dwelling units. Whoever develops this piece of property whether it is one of the developers who is interested now or a developer interested in the future, he is going to develop it so he gets the most return on his investment and I think he will get a better return with townhouses than he will with apartment complexes.

Mr. Flaherty stated: Again my concern is number of units adding to the flow of traffic putting strain on the infrastructure as well as increasing the number of potential kids going to the school system which could cause stress there and increase our taxes on that end. I would ask that you consider some clarification in this as far as units and developable and the maximum number you might have there.

Mr. Soloway stated: I am not sure sections 6.4 or 9.5 were entirely consistent with each other. Someone should take a look at that before this is finalized. In section 9.5 there should be a cross reference to whatever the prevailing requirement happens to be if it is greater than the requirement that you have in there now.

Ms. Caldwell stated: That is a good point. In the one section it says they have to be consistent with COAH regulations and in the other section we are a little more specific and the specifics may or may not meet whatever exactly is in COAH. It is a good point and I will work with our Redevelopment attorney and come up with some language for that.

Vice-Chairman Marion closed this public portion.

Mr. Hardmeyer asked: Can Kathy get out copies of the originals for those that do not have them and then we can finalize things next month?

Mr. Russo stated: I would like this voted on tonight.

Mr. Soloway stated: You may have to vote on this tonight. What you are required to do tonight is very similar to what you do anything time there is a zoning ordinance amendment that gets referred to you after first reading and before the second reading. You should prepare a report noting in the first instance any inconsistencies with the Master Plan and in the 2nd instance any recommendations you may have but the statute says that you are supposed to do that within 45 days of the referral.

Mr. Russo made a motion that this is consistent with the Master Plan with two modifications. One on section 6.2 bulk and setback regulations, the modification on driveways to include concrete or asphalt and to make sure sections 6.4 and 9.5 are cross referenced on the COAH and make sure both of those are consistent. I am saying leave the plan amendment as is that storm water should be optional.

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Ms. Logan asked: Are we in consensus of the gray water. I know Mr. Russo and Mr. Ricciardo do not agree, do we all agree because whatever we put in it is not going to be one person or another it will be the recommendation that we as a Board make. Do we all agree in one degree or another?

Ms. Caldwell stated: It is optional in the plan amendment. The actual plan is inconsistent in some places it says it is mandatory. There is a provision for a waiver for the Planning Board. I think in these economic times I think it is a little bit of a heavy lift to be mandatory.

Vice-Chairman Marion stated: Economic times do change. Maybe next year we will have a booming economy or maybe it will be in the dumps but we don't know. That is something we all need to talk about before we make it mandatory or still optional.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: We worked too hard to fix the leak; why should we give it away?

Mr. Hardmeyer stated: Make it mandatory that they can always come in for a variance.

Mr. Soloway stated: Variances are a little tricky with redevelopment plans.

Ms. Caldwell stated: It is very difficult to ascertain exactly what the requirement is. I believe it would be under some kind of deviation.

Mr. Soloway stated: I think a variance is grantable because it is not a D variance or not the equivalent of a D variance. But obviously the applicant would have to prove its case. Typically it costs too much money is not the best argument for variance relief.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: It was not originally put in the redevelopment plan because we weren't concerned about it, it was inserted into the redevelopment plan because the Governing Body and the Planning Board at that time had a concern for the water allocation so we put this recovery system in so in the future we had enough water to provide for anybody who wanted to development in the Town. I think it is an absolute necessity that it be mandatory. In the long run it is better to invest in the recovery system now than to have to start drilling wells when we don't have enough water to feed what we want to develop. I think it is planning ahead.

Mr. Elvidge stated: I think what Joe is saying is correct and we have all discussed that a number of years ago when we had a 30 or 35% percent water loss. That was a major concern especially when we were getting into our anticipation of growth and our Vision Plan and Master Plan, etc. It still is very important. Every site has to be looked at by the Planning Board on an individual basis and that particular gray water and storm water management is important. I think it should be an option. We picked up 300,000 gallons of water which gave us a lot of breathing room in terms of our growth. When this particular site comes before the Planning Board with an actual plan and it has defined units at that particular time you can look at the Town's records as far as its usage and then ask for hypothetical what the usage would be out of a development like that and how much it will add in terms of usage to the system. Another site may be 50 percent that size or a totally different mix and it give us the option with the information that we have at that particular time to either make it a point or and twist someone's arm and go that route or is it important enough for us to get a development like that and maybe have some compromises and looking at the actual uses of water and looking at what we curb in terms of other options. That leaves us with some type of breathing room with that being said I still have a tremendous concern about water usage. We have done an excellent job in picking up gallons of lost water and that is huge.

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Mr. Ricciardo stated: We have a 100 year old system. There are going to be more breaks, more losses, if we get down to 10% they have done an extremely wonderful job. But you are not going to get there. If you get between 15% and 10% you are doing very well but old systems you are going to lose water. To recapture 20% of the 35% loss is phenomenal.

Mr. Elvidge stated: The system is in place and you know what the lake is sending out now and you know what you are billing. They are accustomed now to look for that deviation.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: We are between 650,000 and 700,000 gallons a day from 1.1 million, we have recovered a lot of water but we want development, we want revitalization, we want upgrades of a lot of buildings and we need that water. I think it is something that should be weighed at each site plan so if you make it mandatory and the right to grant the variance as Mr. Soloway said then they can apply for the variance and come up with a different type of system to supplement the landscaping system.

Mr. Russo stated: My questions is we did not make it mandatory for Martarano or Thorlabs so why are we doing it now.

Vice-Chairman Marion stated: Because we are here talking about it now.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: Every case has its own merit.

Mr. Elvidge seconded the motion because I think it should be optional.

AYE: Mrs. Mattingly, Mr. Elvidge, Mr. Russo, Ms. Logan,

NAY: Mr. Tharp, Mr. Ricciardo, Mr. Hardmeyer, Mr. Steinberg, Vice-Chairman Marion

Mr. Ricciardo made a motion we approve the revision with the driveway options that Mr. Russo stated, the COAH obligation that Mr. Russo stated and that the storm water recovery be mandatory.

Vice-Chairman Marion asked: Does wells fall under options?

Mr. Ricciardo stated: Yes, that is an option.

Ms. Logan asked: Are those the only options or is there something they could do that would relieve some of the water issues without it being a hardship on the developer?

Mr. Steinberg asked: Can the developer come to the Board with a proposed plan if we make it mandatory?

Mr. Ricciardo stated: Mr. Soloway said you can grant the variance for it, you can grant options for it but right now they have to come to the Board and say it is mandatory that you include this but if you can prove to us that you can do it another way other than a storm water recovery system.

Vice-Chairman Marion stated: That give us the option to say we need some type of water saving faucets, etc.

Ms. Logan stated: Is there a particular value for example you have to be able to claim x about of gallons of water?

Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM

Ms. Caldwell stated: There is a section of green building standards and it says they should try to reduce the water usages by 20 percent of what is standard applicable water uses. DEP has a standard for example if you have a single family residence they apply a certain amount of what you average water usage should be so the standard is to try and reduce that by 20 percent through whatever. That is not a mandatory but an encouraged standard within the ordinance to say per water reduction fixtures such as low flow faucets, low flow toilets, etc. That is the standard they are trying to get to.

Ms. Logan asked: If we make that mandatory and not be specific system but a reduction of the use of water or somehow the reclamation of water such that it balances out that they are not using more than x amounts of gallons or whatever the case may be so that it effectively has the same effect without prescribing a specific system?

Vice-Chairman Marion stated: We are not prescribing a specific system there are choices.

Mr. Ricciardo stated: It is a storm recovery option or they have the option to put in a well and run two separate lines to each dwelling unit.

Vice-Chairman Marion stated: Or they have the option to come and request relief for a variance to have us not make that mandatory and have them explain what they want to do.

Ms. Mattingly asked: What is the percentage that you want them to say?

Mr. Ricciardo stated: If you save 10 % of what this Town uses for water you are saving a lot of water, it is over 60,000 gallons.

Mr. Soloway stated: Mr. Ricciardo made a motion that there has been a resolution prepared which basically recites the background, recites the transmittal of the plan for this Board to review, it recites prior history of this plan, recites the fact that this Board considered this evening and the Board finds and determines that the amendments are consistent with the Master Plan and secondly recommends there would be modifications they would be listed on an exhibit and whatever motion gets adoption tonight will convert into a resolution immediately.

Mr. Hardmeyer seconds the motion.

AYE: Mr. Tharp, Mr. Ricciardo, Mr. Hardmeyer; Mr. Steinberg, Vice-Chairman Marion

NAY: Mrs. Mattingly, Mr. Elvidge, Mr. Russo, Ms. Logan

CORRESPONDENCE

Vice-Chairman Marion addressed the correspondence that was in the packet.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NONE

PUBLIC PORTION

No public stepping forward, this portion of the meeting is closed.

**Newton Planning Board
June 18, 2014
7:00 PM**

Mr. Soloway stated: For the record, the Urban Renewal Associates issued a letter to the Board apologizing for confusion they caused when they noticed for a hearing on an application which they have not filed yet.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Ricciardo made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hardmeyer seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 PM with a unanimous "aye" vote. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on July 16, 2014 at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

Respectfully submitted,


Katherine Citterbart
Planning Board Secretary