

**Borough of Florham Park
Planning Board
Work Session Meeting Minutes
March 14, 2022**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Planning Board was called to order on Monday evening, March 14, 2022 at 6:30p.m. The meeting was conducted by virtual means utilizing the Zoom service in accordance with the guidelines set for by the State of New Jersey which explicitly permits a public body to conduct a meeting electronically during a state of emergency.

Members Present:

Mr. Michael DeAngelis – Chairman
Mr. Joseph Guerin
Mayor Mark Taylor
Ms. Kristen Santoro
Mr. Gary Feith
Mr. David Roberts
Mr. Jeffrey Noss
Mr. Sid Dvorkin
Mr. Jeffrey Hegan

Members Absent:

Also Present:

Mr. Michael Sgaramella, Board Engineer
Ms. Katherine Sarmad, Board Planner
Mr. John Miller, Esq. Board Attorney

Statement of Adequate Notice:

Mr. DeAngelis issued the following statement:

“I hereby announce and state that adequate notice of this meeting was provided by the Secretary of this Board by preparing a notice, specifying the time, date and place of this meeting; posting such notice on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building; filing said notice with the Clerk of the Borough forwarding the notice to the Florham Park Eagle, and forwarding, by mail and fax, the said notice to all persons on the request list, and that said notice will be included in the minutes of this meeting. This action is in accordance with N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, et seq., “Open Public Meeting Act.”

Site Plan Waivers:

None.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 6:31pm.

Marlene Rawson
Board Secretary

March 14, 2022

**Borough of Florham Park
Planning Board
Regular Meeting Minutes
March 14, 2022**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Planning Board was called to order on Monday evening, March 14, 2022 at 7:00p.m. The meeting was conducted by virtual means utilizing the Zoom service in accordance with the guidelines set for by the State of New Jersey which explicitly permits a public body to conduct a meeting electronically during a state of emergency.

1. Call to Order.
2. Adequate notice has been given in accordance with the Sunshine Law.
3. Announcement – There will be no new testimony after 9:30 p.m.

Members Present:

Mr. Michael DeAngelis – Chairman
Mr. Joseph Guerin
Mayor Mark Taylor
Ms. Kristen Santoro
Mr. Gary Feith
Mr. David Roberts
Mr. Jeffrey Noss
Mr. Sid Dvorkin
Mr. Jeffrey Hegan

Members Absent:

Also Present:

Mr. Michael Sgaramella, Board Engineer
Ms. Katherine Sarmad, Board Planner
Mr. John Miller, Esq. Board Attorney

Approval of Minutes:

4. Approval of the minutes of the February 28, 2022 meeting.

Mr. Dvorkin made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr.Guerin.

Roll: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted to approve the minutes.

5. **Zoning Ordinance Review Discussion – Katherine Sarmad**

Katherine Sarmad recapped the second draft of the ordinance and summarized the major changes that were agreed to thus far. She then reviewed the discussion from the February 14, 2022 meeting where there was limited Board attendance.

They are:

Proposed C-5 zone and additional uses contemplated for that zone. In addition to all uses currently permitted in the C-1 zone, the two uses would be permitted as conditional uses in order to control the design standards and intensity of the use. They are commissary kitchens and warehouse/distribution center to be conditional uses until we understand better how the uses will actually operate. As of right uses include flex office space, data centers, self-storage, educational training services, exercise and fitness clubs, and pack and ship retail.

Parking ratios will continue to control the number of tenants that can occupy a building. Parking ratios for warehouse/distribution centers was suggested to be one space per 1,000. The new C-5 zone borders the MF-9 zone and the C-1 MFAR zone and Columbia Turnpike on the other end.

The Board agreed on the new zone and the warehouse and commissary kitchen uses to be conditional. There were no comments about the parking ratio of 1 space per 1,000sf.

Building lot coverage definition modification. This includes eliminating overhangs up to 18 inches from counting towards building coverage. It also eliminates accessory structures up to 200 feet from counting as building coverage. The accessory structures will still count towards total lot coverage. The Board agreed to this.

Improved lot coverage definition modification. The water surface area of a pool will be exempt from the lot coverage calculation. This will provide some flexibility for residents who are near the maximum lot coverage. The Board agreed to this.

Katherine Sarmad showed an example of a sliding scale for building coverage. This chart reduced the number of percentage increments in an effort to simplify the schedule. The result is that many lot sizes gained a small increase in building coverage. A few will lose a small amount. It was noted that oversized lots seem to be at a disadvantage. Because of that, lots 40,000 or greater in the R25 and R44 zones are proposed to be 10% building coverage.

Another option is to create a table based on the zone and a straight proportion of the zone. Essentially the same percentage of open space would be achieved on any size lot. However, it would allow for larger homes.

The Board seemed to like the simplified sliding scale chart that was discussed.

Katherine Sarmad reiterated that this is an option to consider only if the Board desires to simplify the table. She continued that the current table is very equitable. She believes that it was drafted this way due to oversized lots in the R-15 zone. She reminded the Board that other changes will allow more building coverage overall such as the elimination of the overhangs.

Katherine Sarmad said she does not necessarily agree that changing the chart is the right thing to do at this time and it could have unintended consequences. She thought that we should wait and see what happens because of the other changes before revising the building coverage percentage table.

However, Katherine Sarmad agrees that adjusting the coverage in the larger residential zones makes sense. She also said that the R-88 zone is proposed to increase from 5% to 6% for building coverage.

Corner lots still need further study and may not be part of this review. Mike DeAngelis was unclear how the new home on Salvatore Court was able to be oriented the way it is. Mike Sgaramella replied that the Board required that the front door face the cul-de-sac. It is confusing how the front yard is determined on a corner lot. The front door does not necessarily face the front yard. Jeff Noss added that there are a significant number of corner lots in the Borough, especially the R-15 zone. Katherine Sarmad said there is a great potential for unintended consequences and more investigation is needed before recommending a change.

Residential setbacks. It was brought up that that R-15 zone rear yard setback is higher than any other zone with an average of 60 feet. This was put in place in an effort to control development of oversized lots. Katherine Sarmad suggested reducing it to either 50 feet or 40 feet, which would match the R-25 zone. This will help with deck requests that currently encroach into 60 yard setback. However, the R-15 zone sees most of the teardowns and rebuilds and reducing the rear yard setback could create a significant negative impact. The Board agreed that some adjustment is needed and seemed to like 45 feet as the setback. The matter is still under discussion.

Buffer areas: The buffer areas within a PB zone between a non-residential use or a multi-family use and a single-family residential zone line is decreased to 50 feet. Swimming pool setbacks will be at least 10 feet from the property lines. The Board agreed to these changes.

Accessory structures: Up to 100 square feet and 10 feet high - setback is three feet. Structures do not count as building coverage but counts towards lot coverage. Accessory structures 101 feet up to 200 feet and 10 feet high – setback is five feet. They also do not count as building coverage but counts toward lot coverage. No automobile storage permitted. There is a dimension recommendation from the Construction official. It was noted that there is a separate provision for a detached garage (600 square foot limit).

Sheds no greater than 250 square feet shall be allowed in non-residential zones, provided that there are no other accessory structures on the lot.

EV Stations: Most language cannot be modified from the State ordinance. The signage section has been modified to exclude digital signage and billboards. EV stations on municipal property should be fee based. No overnight parking allowed. Maximum charging time was discussed. Modifications addressing this will be drafted.

University zone signage. Language to reflect PODS signage for lot area within 200 feet of Park Avenue. Signage beyond that and interior to the campus will not be regulated. There are no signage changes proposed in the B-1 zone. Proposed C-5 zone will have signage to mirror C-1, C-2, C-3 requirements. Larger ground signs will be permitted in C-1 zone in areas with large frontages.

Katherine Sarmad stated that the next steps are to incorporate the feedback and other comments from this meeting in order to get comfortable with the ordinance. A final draft can be prepared for the next meeting. Once the document is finalized, a summary presentation will be given for the Borough Council.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Richard Burrow, Langan Engineering. He stated that he is working with Columbia Fernwood Associates on 8 Fernwood. He stated that he is pleased with the presentation, and he likes the idea of a new zone called C-5. He does not agree with the parking ratio of one space per 1,000 square feet in the C-5 zone. He stated that he did his own research and the average parking ratio is one space per 1,800 square feet. He felt that lowering the parking ratio would reduce the potential for parking lot expansions in order to meet the needs of the warehouse and comply with the ordinance.

There were no other questions or comments. Mr. DeAngelis called for a motion to adjourn.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:40pm.

Marlene Rawson
Board Secretary

March 14, 2022