

PRINCETON ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

**Minutes of Meeting of November 15, 2010– 7:30pm
Meeting Room A
Township Municipal Building
400 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ 08540**

I. Opening Statement

Adequate notice of this meeting as required by Sections 3d and 4a of the Open Public Meetings Act has been provided and filed with the Township and Borough Clerks.

II. Chair Wasserman opened the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Present were: Wasserman, Hiltner (arrived late), Machold, Hamilton, Ullman, Kaczerski, Rojer, Martindell and Lempert

Absent were: Roberts, Thoft and Eiref

There were 4 members of the public present.

III. Approval of Agenda: A motion was made and seconded and the Commission voted unanimously to approve the agenda.

IV. Minutes:

A motion was made and seconded and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the minutes of October 27, 2010.

V. Public Comment:

The members of the public present were there to comment on the impervious coverage ordinance that was being presented; therefore they held off commenting until the appropriate time.

VI. Discussions/Decisions:

- a) **Township Update:** Lempert noted that the Flag Lot Ordinance was passed at the last Township Committee meeting with the understanding that the PEC may want to look at it further.
- b) **Time of Decision:** Lempert said that Princeton University will be presenting the plans for the Arts & Transit district sometime in the future. Wasserman noted that he will speak to Kristen Appleget about presenting to the PEC as well.
- c) **Ricciardi Tract:** Lempert said that the closing for this property should occur before the end of the year.
- d) **Borough Update:** Martindell said that the PEC should contribute to the conversation of the Arts & Transit district with regards to LEED and mass

transit. Wasserman said he has been in contact with one of the Professors at Rowan University about coming and talking to the PEC about his expertise in that field. He said he will also follow-up with ANJEC about this subject.

- e) **Leaf Collection in the Borough:** Martindell noted that Borough Council will be discussing leaf collection. He asked how many residents are currently using the bags because he has received conflicting information about it. Kiser noted that about 20% of the residents are using the bags because they find it to be quicker and more efficient. There was a brief discussion about community education when it comes to leaf collection and perhaps the reverse 911 system can be utilized to inform residents about the laws.
- f) **Resolution for Emily Reeves:** Wasserman read a resolution into the record thanking Emily Reeves for her service on the PEC. A motion was made and seconded and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the resolution.
- g) **Impervious Surface Coverage Ordinance:** Jennifer Coffey and Joan McGee (Stony Brook Watershed) spoke regarding the memo that was sent to the PEC with regards to the changes to this ordinance. Some of the suggestions made were to reduce the impervious coverage on the residential lots, more clearly define impervious coverage, recommending a 20% ISC for all non-residential lots. Solow noted that most non-residential lots are controlled by FAR there are no ISC regulations in place for non-residential lots; these lots are required to have a storm-water review and then to put some type of storm-water management in place on the lot. This ordinance Solow noted, is strictly for residential lots and the regulations are just being tightened up. He said he would need more information in order to come back to the PEC with any possible changes for non-residential areas. Coffey noted that non-residential ISC is much more devastating to the streams than residential lots. Kiser noted that the non-residential lots are required to have detention basins that are based on the 100 year flood plain and it restricts the water that flows out from it. McGee referred to the definitions in the ordinance (missing an action word). Wasserman asked if there was any part of the ordinance that states that knocking down trees to build parking lots is not something that is encouraged. Machold noted that the tree ordinance that is in place helps to discourage that. Kiser noted that staff is trying to find the right balance of protecting the environment without encroaching on the rights of property owners. Solow noted that staff is also listening to the community and those that have reached out saying they want the regulations tightened up. Solow also noted that there are not many large non-residential tracts of land left. There was a discussion over the following items: commercial tracts of land and developing more stringent regulations with regards to ISC and if it would be held up in court if challenged; making the ISC definition more understandable; how non-residential lots are regulated by lot size rather than zoning districts; the distinctions between column “a” and column “b” in the ordinance; and how the original ordinance was set up to control the flooding issues primarily along the Harry’s Brook area. There were a few members of the public who made comments: Ms. Killington of Lawrenceville said she agrees with comments that were made by Magee and Coffey; Ms. Ryan talked about leaf collection and the ISC ordinance saying there needs to be some

controls in place for the non-residential lots; Ms. Cherry said there needs to be some definition of the “best management practices” with regards to the ISC ordinance; for instance what are enhanced controls? Wasserman asked for comments from the Commission members. Hamilton suggested that Solow and staff look at the definition of ISC and try to provide residents with more guidance about permissible pervious surface coverage choices. It was suggested that the Watershed work with the Planner in helping to gather information about non-residential properties in order to come up with some ISC regulations. Wasserman closed the discussion on the ISC Ordinance. It was also noted that the PEC was onboard to hold a discussion on the Stream Corridor Ordinance at its December meeting, however the County is holding a meeting on waste water that evening and the Watershed would be attending and could not attend the PEC meeting. It was decided that the PEC would not discuss the Stream Corridor ordinance until its January meeting and will try and get the University to come to the December meeting to make a presentation on the Arts and Transit District and perhaps catch up on other issues that have been put on the back burner the last few months. A motion was made and seconded and the Commission voted unanimously to move the Stream Corridor discussion to the PEC meeting in January. (That meeting date will be determined at the December meeting when the 2011 schedule is adopted).

VII. Updates and Regular Business:

- a) **Chairs report:** Wasserman talked about a discussion he attended at the library titled “Greening Harvard”. He said he walked away with a lot of information that he brought back to his employer and he shared parts of the discussion with the PEC. He especially focused on the issue of how to get people involved and how someone must be committed to the cause in order to get others involved. There was also a brief discussion on how Sustainable Princeton can help the PEC achieve its goals. Lempert noted that people are willing to change as long as it is “easy”.
- b) **Regional Planning Board:** Ullman explained that the Chair of the Circulation Sub-Committee – Yina Moore, will be looking at the circulation element to bring it up-to-date especially with regards to the Arts & Transit district and the DOT plans to cut off access to Princeton via Route #1. She said it was Moore’s suggestion that perhaps the PEC would like to review the element as well to insure that sustainability is brought into the plan. She also noted the PEC has been more effective in obtaining its goals in the past 3 years than it has since its inception. She commended the PEC on the work that it does. Kaczerski acknowledged that there has been changed but the Regional Planning Board and the Governing Bodies hear the urgency of sustainability given where the world is now with the environment.

VIII. Adjournment:

A motion was made and seconded and the Commission voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Debra L. Rogers, Secretary

Date Approved: December 15, 2010