

**PRINCETON ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION**

**Minutes of Meeting of February 23, 2011– 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 7:33 p.m.**

Present were: Wasserman, Machold, Hamilton, Hiltner, Kaczerski, Miller, Fichtenbaum, Rojer, Ullman, Crumiller and Nemeth

Absent were: Thoft, Eiref and Ernst

There were 10 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 February 2, 2011.

**V. Public Comment:**

Mr. Robert Hillier spoke of his pending application on Bunn Drive. He briefly discussed the storm-water drainage saying he will be rebuilding the retention basin at Princeton Community Housing and correcting the piping so the water will flow the way it is supposed to.

**VI. Discussion and Decisions:**

**a) Township Updates:** Nemeth didn't not have anything to report.

**b) Borough Updates:** Crumiller stated that the pool bond was approved and that Council also appointed a nominating committee who will work with the Township and Princeton University on the Arts & Transit districts. She noted that minutes will be kept of those meetings.

**c) Development Applications:**

**J. Robert Hillier – Bunn Drive:** Ullman recused herself from commenting on the application because it will be coming to the Planning Board. Wasserman noted that there is a draft resolution/memo from the Development Review Subcommittee regarding this application. Kaczerski said the subcommittee

reviewed this application on the LEED aspects but then when they looked at it in more detail the subcommittee compared it to Hillier's 2009 application for the Lowe Tract. She said when the subcommittee looked at the memo that the PEC sent regarding that application they decided the Bunn Drive application needs to be looked at more closely. She suggested that the PEC table a decision on the memo until next month. She went on to ask Mr. Hillier a few questions regarding the proposed right-of-way, storm-water and blasting at the site. Mr. Hillier responded saying that nothing will be built in the r-o-w; regarding the water runoff he described a cistern that they will be installing to reuse the water on the site, retention ponds, new pipes and a spill-lake; with regard to the blasting he said they are running test pits and he does not anticipate any blasting. He noted that there are 65 people on the waiting list for these units most are aged 70 years and older mainly because the units will be rental thus there will not be a homeowners association. Hamilton inquired whether he has a checklist for LEED Silver and if so, would he be willing to share it with the PEC. Hillier said he would be happy to do so. Hamilton noted that this site can be used as an educational site with regards to sustainability and Hillier said it will be a real model for "green" initiatives. Hillier also noted that they are trying to get the Township to allow garbage disposals in the units so the food waste can be removed and composted on the site. Members on the PEC and the SBMWS commended Hillier on his proposal. The PEC then had a brief discussion on the timing of the memo and if it could be done at the next PEC meeting on March 23, 2011. Solow said the Planning Office will work with the PEC because the application will not be heard by the Planning Board until April.

**All Saints Church Application:** Kaczerski commended All Saints Church on its application and for its willingness to wait it out for the sale of the 35 acres of land for conservation. She said the development review committee had no comments on this application.

**Princeton University Arts & Transit Proposal:** Wasserman noted there currently is not an application for the arts & transit proposal by Princeton University; however, he invited Kristen Appleget to join the PEC for the meeting. He said the development review committee has written a draft resolution regarding the dinky. Hamilton said she thought it was important that the PEC go on record regarding the mass transit aspect of the arts & transit proposal. The PEC then had a brief discussion with Ms. Appleget regarding the right-of-way preservation. Ms. Appleget stated that Princeton University does not own the train track r-o-w to Nassau Street. Appleget noted that PU received a letter from the Governor stating that if they were interested in keeping the dinky it should be moved to a hub that is more assessable to pedestrian and mass transit. She said PU feels its proposal would allow the dinky to stay and the project would be privately funded. The PEC discussed the fact that there is no real promise that the dinky will be preserved by PU or New Jersey Transit. Ms. Appleget noted that 40% of the dinky usage is affiliated with PU – therefore the dinky's use is beneficial to PU but they would like to have a multi-faceted mass transit hub. She

noted that New Jersey Transit feels that usage will increase if the dinky station is moved. It was also noted by the PEC that the hospital site will have new residential units that will need more mass transit. Appleget noted that the University Tiger Shuttle is free to the public to use. She noted that parking on the University will remain the same – they want to reduce the number of cars on the campus so they will encourage people to use public transportation. She also noted that this will be a great sustainable project – PU is looking for LEED Silver certification. It was suggested that PU create parking near the new hub to make it easier for commuters. Appleget noted that PU wants to reduce the number of cars and may not be in favor of that. Hiltner suggested that the PEC review the plans more clearly and then send a letter of support based on the sustainable aspects of the project. Machold said the PEC should work around the dinky issue. Hamilton said she thinks the group should decide one way or another if the dinky should be moved. Machold and Hiltner said the PEC should vote on the whole project and not just the dinky issue. Solow suggested that the PEC send something to the governing bodies once it has reached a consensus about the project. Wasserman asked if anyone would like to make a motion to approve the current resolution that was drafted by Thoft (as a member of the Development Review Subcommittee). Hearing none, he asked that the development review subcommittee go back and draft something that speaks to the whole project and concentrate on the sustainable aspects of the project. Hiltner said he could put together a fact sheet on the proposal and circulate it to the PEC; and solicit comments from the PEC before writing a resolution.

**Impervious Surface Coverage Ordinance:** Wasserman noted that the PEC discussed this ordinance back in the fall. He said the ordinance applies only to residential lots but the PEC discussed adding non-residential lots. He said Lee Solow is back to continue the discussion on this. Solow explained that the ordinance before them is an amendment to the original ordinance that was adopted a few years back. He said the ordinance regulates the impervious surface coverage on all residential lots. He said the amendment is being proposed to tighten up the percentages based on the information that they have been able to gather from building permits that have been submitted in the last 3-4 years. The PEC discussed the ordinance and asked for more information on the data that they used to formulate the amendment. Specifically, the PEC is interested in the number of lots by size (residential and non-residential). Solow said he will forward the data to Wasserman along with other data on the lots in the township. The PEC discussed the issue of water quality and how any impervious surface coverage over 10% will impact the water quality. Chris Tarr said that it is unrealistic to just reduce the ISC by 2% on all lots. He asked if this ordinance account for the cluster lots that were built on smaller lots as per the cluster ordinance. He said the ordinance needs to address that issue in order to put a fair ordinance into place. Lyn Durkee asked why the Princeton Shopping Center is allowed so much ISC and yet the homeowners are being penalized. Joan McGee stated that non-residential lots need to be included in the ordinance. She noted that any ISC over 10% should be removed from the ordinance. Solow stated that

the ISC was developed to address the water quality issue. He noted that the reduction of 2% is small enough not to impact most homeowners. He also noted that he will look at the cluster developments also. He stated that the non-residential land is a small component in Princeton Township. Hamilton suggested that the lots with a lot of ISC should be looked at and not the lots that have anything. Wasserman said that he will look at the data given to him by Solow and then formulate a resolution for PEC to vote on.

**Stream Buffer Ordinance:** Wasserman noted that the stream buffer ordinance was on the PEC agenda but given the late hour the PEC would not be discussing this ordinance at this meeting. It would be discussed at a future meeting of the PEC. However, He invited members of the public to comment on the ordinance since they had been waiting patiently all night to make their points. Steve Frakt, Lake Drive, said that this ordinance should have been discussed from the ordinance being drafted. He noted that the ISC ordinance may accomplish protecting the streams and water corridors without even having to adopt an ordinance like this. He said 150 foot buffer is a large hardship to homeowners – noting that that buffer would come into his living room. He said this ordinance does not take into account the lot sizes or the existing neighborhood characteristics. He said this ordinance would devalue homes – no one would want to buy a lot that has a 150 buffer, especially when that buffer encompasses the entire lot. Chris Tarr said there are tributaries all over the township and this ordinance has the potential to affect many lots in the township. Solow said that he has heard some very valued points and would like to revisit the drafting of the ordinance. A motion was made and seconded to officially remove the unofficial stream buffer ordinance from the record and that Lee Solow work with the PEC and SBMWS to draft something based on the comments about preserving stream corridors and water quality. It was also noted that the PEC tabled this discussion. . (?? Not sure what this sentence is referring to but if there is no more information about the ‘further discussions’, please remove).

**Recreation:** It was noted that the pool bond ordinance passed in the Borough.

**SPRAB:** Wasserman noted that the PEC needs to have 2 reps in place for SPRAB. Right now the only rep is Thoft and he asked for a volunteer for the second position. He noted that the second person would only need to attend when Thoft could not. Fichtenbaum said she would discuss it with Thoft and as long as it was not something she had to attend regularly she would volunteer.

**Chairs Report:** Wasserman asked for a volunteer to attend the SBMWS Stream Clean-up event in March. Fichtenbaum volunteered to attend the event on April 9, 2011 from 1:00 -3:00.

Wasserman noted the Updike Farm will open in April as a second home of the Historical Society. He said they are looking to “green” the site and will bring plans to the PEC.

Wasserman also asked the members to review the subcommittee list and be prepared to come back next month and sign up for a subcommittee that they feel they can devote some time to.

- VII. Adjournment:** A motion was made and seconded and the Commission voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 10:33 p.m.

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Debra Rogers, Secretary**

**Date Approved: March 23, 2011**