

APPROVED: November 14, 2011

WEST WINDSOR TOWNSHIP COUNCIL  
BUSINESS SESSION  
September 19, 2011

CALL TO ORDER: President Khanna called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

This is to advise that the notice requirement provided for in the "Open Public Meetings Act" has been satisfied. Notice of this meeting was properly given and transmitted to The Times and Princeton Packet; filed with the Clerk of the Municipality; and posted in the West Windsor Township Municipal Building at North Post and Clarksville Roads on January 7, 2011.

ATTENDEES: President: Khanna; Vice President: Ciccone; Council: Borek, Geevers, Morgan; Township Attorney: Cayci; Business Administrator: Hary; Township Clerk: Young

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Ms. Young led the salute to the flag.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jerry Foster, 15 Suffolk Lane, congratulated the Township on achieving a Bronze "Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC)" designation from the League of American Bicyclists.

Mr. George Gati, 71 Danville Drive, made relative comparisons as it relates to crime prevention between the town in California where his son lives and West Windsor Township. He noted that West Windsor is a safe community to live in.

Mr. John Church, 11 Princeton Place, asked to speak about Resolution 2011-R183 which references the Planning Board's recommendations regarding ordinances 2011-16 and 2011-17.

Ms. Cayci asked him to hold his comments until the public hearing for the ordinances.

MAYOR/ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS

Mayor Hsueh spoke about the Bronze level recognition the Township received for being a bicycling friendly community. He also outlined the concept plans for the proposed parking lot off of Alexander Road.

Mayor Hsueh reviewed the history of the Redevelopment Plan and the Transit Village at the Princeton Junction Train Station. He outlined the InterCap litigation process up to and including the Settlement Agreement and ordinances which are before Council for adoption. Mayor Hsueh spoke about the wetlands, NJ Transit and the Dinky Crossing, Vaughn Drive and parking at the train station.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Geevers asked Administration to keep residents informed about any potential flood remediation. She asked Administration to follow up with JCP&L regarding the power outage issue that occurred during Hurricane Irene.

Motion to carry the Mayor's comments to the public hearing portion of the meeting: Morgan

Second: Ciccone

RCV: aye Borek  
aye Ciccone  
aye Geevers  
aye Morgan  
aye Khanna

Mr. Morgan advised that he prepared an ordinance pertaining to political signs for discussion and introduction. He asked to have it added to the agenda.

Motion to add the political sign ordinance to the agenda:

Ciccone

Second: Geevers

RCV: aye Borek  
aye Ciccone  
aye Geevers  
aye Morgan  
aye Khanna

Mr. Morgan made reference to receiving information from Administration at the last minute which interferes with Council's decision-making process.

Mr. Borek congratulated the West Windsor Bicycle and Pedestrian Alliance for the Bronze level recognition. He addressed several other points of concern including pothole repairs and the problems the Township experienced with JCP&L.

Ms. Ciccone addressed several housekeeping issues and recognized the following groups for their volunteerism: the Farmers' Market and their volunteers; Bicycle and Pedestrian Alliance, Environmental Commission for their Sustainable New Jersey recognition; Parking Authority; and the various sports organizations that maintain the playing fields throughout the Township.

#### CHAIR/CLERK COMMENTS

President Khanna also congratulated the West Windsor Bicycle and Pedestrian Alliance for their achievement. He also complimented the Township staff, Chief Pica, and Emergency Services for all their hard work during Hurricane Irene.

#### PUBLIC HEARING

President Khanna reviewed the recent events and the dates associated with the Settlement Agreement with InterCap and the ordinances. He addressed the fiscal impact analysis, outlined the process, and spoke about the various scenarios in the impact study that provided a tax positive project. President Khanna noted that the Township Engineer addressed stormwater issues and advised that stormwater will not affect the redevelopment area.

He also addressed concerns with the increase of school-aged children at the Transit Village.

2011-16     AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PRINCETON JUNCTION AND THE CODIFYING PROVISIONS THEREFOR AND AMENDING CHAPTER 200 OF THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF WEST WINDSOR (1999)- Amending Ordinance 2011-05

President Khanna opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cayci reviewed the details of the ordinance.

Mr. Roger Thomas, 38 Woodhollow Road, spoke about moving the process forward.

Ms. Leslie Fox, 2 Baylor Place, advised that she was in favor of the adoption of the ordinances.

Mr. John Church, 11 Princeton Place, addressed several issues with the ordinances and spoke about the fiscal impact analysis prepared by Tischler Bise.

Mr. Jared Kieling, 116 Fisher Place, supports redevelopment in West Windsor.

Mr. Bryan Maher, 135 Penn Lyle Road, supports the development of Rte. 571 which is in need of improvements. He addressed several issues pertaining to the fiscal impact analysis, the costs generated by the Redevelopment Plan, and the number of school-aged children proposed for the Transit Village.

Ms. Joan Bharucha, 4 Lakeshore Drive, noted that seniors want to stay in their homes but cannot afford the high taxes and do not like the traffic congestion. She advised that both taxes and congestion will increase with the redevelopment.

Mr. Allen Marx, 101 Claridge Court, advised that the Arts Council Building was an asset to the community as well as the future Transit Village.

Ms. Ina Marx, 101 Claridge Court, spoke of reasons to support the Transit Village.

Ms. Paola Belloch, 281 Clarksville Road, urged Council to vote in favor of the Transit Ville.

Mr. Andrew Belloch, 281 Clarksville Road, noted his strong support for the Transit Village and advised that it would be an enormous boost to the community.

Mr. Imran Shah, 10 Dey Farm Drive, voiced his support for the redevelopment project.

Ms. Farvah Shah, 10 Dey Farm Drive, voiced her support for the redevelopment project.

Ms. Ana Lomba, 2 Hereford Drive, advised that the quality of life is important and supports the Transit Village.

Ms. Ellen Calman, 5 Almond Court, wants to continue to live in West Windsor and would like redevelopment at the train station. She noted that the Township needs a downtown area.

Mr. Hemi Nae, 11 Wycombe Way, suggested an independent consultant create a fiscal analysis for the Township. He spoke about the cost to purchase a unit at the Transit Village.

Mr. Tom Carroll, 15 Hathaway Drive, spoke of the community needing a heart and soul especially at the train station. He noted his support for redevelopment.

Ms. Rodica Perciali, 114 Washington Road, advised that a brochure promoting the Transit Village was never created. She noted her support for the Transit Village.

Mr. Javier Villota, 7 Hampton Court, commented that the Transit Village will promote the community and urged Council to vote yes on the ordinances.

Mr. Christopher Couture, 26 Fieldston Road, noted that he and his wife are a young couple without children and would like to see the community grow and the Transit Village will add to the sense of community.

Mr. David Siegel, 17 Berrien Avenue, urged Council to vote against the ordinances and not trust the financial information provided in the impact study.

Ms. Wan-Lin Yan, 19 Wilson Way North, urged a "yes" vote for redevelopment.

Mr. Rustom Bhojti, 5 Park Hill Terrace, commented that he was in favor of the Redevelopment Plan and urged Council to move forward with the project.

Mr. Jonathan Gross, 3 Stuart Lane West, wants to see a Township Center for West Windsor. He spoke about all the benefits of a Transit Village and noted his reservations about the housing component.

Mr. Paul Verma, 3 Marblehead Drive, thanked the Mayor and Council for their efforts with the redevelopment process.

Mr. George Gati, 71 Danville Drive, advised that West Windsor is a great township with a great school district and he urged Council to vote yes.

Ms. Janet Lerner, 67 Rainflower Lane, wants to live long enough to see the Transit Village built and what it will offer the Township.

Mr. Alvin Lerner, 67 Rainflower Lane, noted that the Transit Village resolves a lot of public issues and provides the community with a town center.

Mr. Arnold Sirota, 14 Wycombe Way, noted his concerns with the redevelopment.

Ms. Kristina Samonte, 16 Caleb Lane, commented on her support for the redevelopment project and urged Council to adopt the ordinances. She noted that the Redevelopment Plan is a key advantage for West Windsor.

Mr. John Mulcahy, 2 Hereford Drive, advised that other Townships have a downtown and West Windsor needs a town center. He urged for a "yes" vote.

Ms. Lindsay Diehl, 2 Colonial Avenue, urged Council to vote to adopt the ordinances. She advised that there has been enough analysis done. Ms. Diehl noted that West Windsor needs a town center.

Mr. Greg Harris, 16 Piedmont Drive, suggested that Route 571 be addressed first in the redevelopment of the area. He spoke about the need for an independent fiscal analysis and also had concerns about the number of school-aged children that would be generated from the Redevelopment Plan.

Ms. Alison Miller, 41 Windsor Drive, would like to see the Transit Village developed but also the Windsor Plaza shopping center. She spoke about the history of the Toll Brothers litigation and the project known as the Estates at Princeton Junction.

Mr. Richard Eland, 4 Courtney Drive, spoke about this discussion being part of the democratic process. He advised that Windsor Plaza is part of the Redevelopment Plan and advised that another fiscal impact study will be conducted at the Planning Board level.

Motion to close public hearing: Borek

Second: Ciccone

RCV: aye Borek

aye Ciccone

aye Geevers

aye Morgan

aye Khanna

Ms. Geevers spoke of several issues of concern including the housing component and the parking space size and which are addressed in the ordinances.

Mr. Borek noted that the decrease in parking will promote walking and bicycling in the area. He advised that he supports redevelopment and the adoption of the ordinances.

Mr. Morgan explained that the adoption of the ordinances would settle the litigation with InterCap and he spoke about the negotiation process. He noted that Council's role is to determine if the project is tax positive. Mr. Morgan advised that Council was not provided enough information to feel confident to vote on adopting the ordinances.

Ms. Ciccone outlined key dates in the redevelopment process and noted that in March of 2008 the opportunity to discuss issues with InterCap came and went. She advised that InterCap chose to sue the Township versus working with the Township. Ms. Ciccone noted that there is flexibility in the ordinances for the Township to work with.

Ms. Ciccone acknowledged that she was in favor of adopting the ordinances to end the litigation and clarified several points of misunderstanding including Mr. Golden's mailings which included false information.

President Khanna spoke about his role in the recent settlement of the litigation. He acknowledged the importance of Council being able to make an informed decision. President Khanna advised that a positive vote will bring West Windsor closer to having a Transit Village.

Motion to move forward Resolution 2011-R183 for discussion:

Ciccone

Second: Borek

RCV: aye Borek

aye Ciccone

aye Geevers

aye Morgan

aye Khanna

2011-R183 Resolution Addressing Planning Board Recommendations  
Regarding Ordinances 2011-16 and 2011-17

WHEREAS, the West Windsor Township Council introduced Ordinances 2011-16 and 2011-17 to implement in part an Amendment to Settlement and Redeveloper's Agreement with InterCap Holdings that had been approved by Resolution 2011-R133 on July 11, 2011; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance 2011-16 amends land use standards that would be applied to the 24.5 acre InterCap site by amending the Redevelopment Plan for Princeton Junction (hereinafter, "Redevelopment Plan"), which Council approved pursuant to statute and which is independent of the Township Master Plan, and its codifying sections in the Land Use code; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance 2011-17 sets forth land use standards that would be applied to the 24.5 acre InterCap site only if the Redevelopment Plan was invalidated; and

WHEREAS, on August 17, 2011 both of the aforesaid Ordinances were reviewed by the West Windsor Township Planning Board (hereafter, "the Board") pursuant to the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law and the Municipal Land Use Law. Such statutes provide that the Planning Boards report to the governing body on land use ordinances referred to it. The report must identify any provisions in the Ordinances inconsistent with the Master Plan and any other matters as the Board deems appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the Board determined to retain separate consultants to assist it in this review. Such consultants prepare reports for the Board that were the subject of the August 17, 2011 Board meeting; and

WHEREAS, on September 7, 2011, the Board adopted a Resolution of Referral and Recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, NJSA 40A:12A-7e, and Municipal Land Use Law, NJSA 40:55D-26, require the Township Council to review the report of the Board and provide that it may approve, disapprove, or change any recommendation by a vote of a majority of its fully authorized membership and shall record in its minutes the reasons for not following said recommendations; and

WHEREAS, Township Council has reviewed the Board's resolution, whose recommendations are quoted in full below. In response to such recommendations, the Township has negotiated further with InterCap as to the dispersal of the for sale affordable units; secured a court order protecting it from any further affordable housing obligation generated by development on the site that is required by future changes in the law; and prepared a fiscal impact report. Council otherwise disapproves such recommendations for the reasons set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Township Council of the Township of West Windsor as follows:

1. "Goal 1 in the Redevelopment Plan states that the Plan will result in development which is tax positive or tax neutral. The Planning Board continues to recommend that the Township Council obtain a developed and updated fiscal impact report in order to establish that the development regulation, which is proposed, will result in a tax positive or tax neutral financial impact upon the municipality. The revised proposed Ordinance 2011-16 does not address this concern which was detailed in the prior Resolution of the Board."

*Response: The Township has distributed the fiscal impact study done by Tischler Bise on behalf of InterCap.*

2. "Goal 3 of the Redevelopment Plan requires compliance with COAH growth share requirements. While the Board recognizes that the Growth Share requirements are no longer valid, it also recognizes that it is likely to be replaced by a 10%-20% affordable housing share requirement. The proposed implementing Ordinance 2011-16 requires a minimum 12.2% share of affordable housing or inclusionary housing units on site. The Planning Board recommends that the agreement and implementing Ordinance be modified to require the developer of District 1 to satisfy any and all inclusionary housing requirements which may be imposed upon West Windsor Township pursuant to applicable regulation at the time of any future application for Site Plan approval but in no event less than 12.2 percent. Such a requirement will thereby ensure that West Windsor Township will not be exposed to any future costs and/or expense associated with satisfying any inclusionary housing requirements generated as a result of the development of District 1."

*Response: The Resolution points out that the Redevelopment Plan requires compliance with COAH growth share requirements while the Ordinances specify a 12.2% set aside and do not provide that the developer satisfy any future affordable housing obligation that is imposed. The 12.2% set aside includes low- and very-low-income units as well as moderate-income units, as compared to the 5% set aside, with all the units being moderate income, in the original ordinances. The amendatory ordinances thus represent a substantial increase in the number of affordable units that will be provided. The number required is not inconsistent with the growth share requirement in the Redevelopment Plan, since the growth share methodology, as the Board recognizes in its resolution, has been invalidated. The Board also notes, and Council agrees, that the growth share will likely "be replaced by a 10% - 20% affordable housing share requirement," a range within which the new affordable housing requirement for the InterCap site falls.*

*As to the Board's recommendation that the District 1 developer be required to satisfy any future affordable housing obligation relating to that district, the court has entered an order providing that the 12.2% shall be treated as fully satisfying any future affordable housing obligation that is generated by development on the site, thus satisfying the concern expressed by the Board. The order also provides, consistent with the Planning Board recommendation, that the 12.2% obligation would continue to apply, as it would in any event, since the court order will be approving the affordable housing provisions in the agreement, including the 12.2% provision. This provision is part of a broader set of provisions that find the affordable housing provisions in the Settlement Agreement satisfactory and fair to the low- and moderate-income class and approve the Settlement Agreement, including the affordable housing provisions.*

*Lastly, the 12.2% requirement is a robust one given the extraordinary costs associated with development on the InterCap site and other transit villages, including those related to acquisition of developed land, lost cash flow as existing space is decommissioned, site preparation, including in InterCap's case demolition of the 13 Class C office buildings and associated parking lots and drives, infrastructure costs both on- and off-site, provision in InterCap's case of right-of-way for a major regional road, Vaughn Drive, and the costs of public amenities and high quality architecture. A 2006 study entitled Housing Diversity and Affordability in New Jersey's Transit Villages is the most comprehensive study of transit villages undertaken, and it shows that of the 16 transit villages then in place, including those in urban centers, only one has a higher affordable housing percentage than the 12.2%, and in that case all of the units were federally subsidized. The average set aside in those transit villages was 4 to 5%, with the average set aside for family units being 1.4 to 1.7%. None of the units on the InterCap site will be age-restricted, and, as with West Windsor's affordable housing program generally, the propose affordable housing component in District 1 compares most favorably to those in other transit villages around the State.*

3. "The Redevelopment Plan Goal 2 provides for market rate housing units and affordable units to be integrated into any housing area. The proposed ordinance change dealing with the "clustering" of affordable housing units does not accommodate integration of affordable units. The term clustering is ambiguous in view of the stated goals and objectives of the redevelopment plan. As such, ordinance 2011-16 is inconsistent with the espoused "integration" goals of the plan. The Board recommends that Council eliminate the proposed additional language modifying Goal 2 of the redevelopment plan and retain the original language without modification to ensure consistency with the Plan as it relates to inclusionary housing goals and objectives."

*Response: The Board notes that the Redevelopment Plan requires integration of the market and affordable units. The clustering provision in the two Ordinances is consistent with the language in the Redevelopment Plan in codified sections 200-257B(2)(a)[5] and 200-257C(2)(a) and (d) requiring integration of and dispersal of the affordable units. Limiting the affordable units in one building to no more than 35% of the total number of units in the building will prevent all-affordable buildings, a condition the integration requirement seeks to avoid, and ensures that affordable rental units will be located in several buildings. They will thus be dispersed through the project, albeit not evenly (i.e., one affordable unit every eight or nine market units, rather than concentrated in one location.*

*In addition, the clustering of rental affordable units within buildings is appropriate given the advisability of having a separate condominium association for those units in order for the owner of the rental units to have control over maintenance rather than maintenance responsibilities being ceded to a condominium board controlled by unit owners. Such a separate condominium association, which would be part of a broader master association that includes the ownership units and the retail space, would also avoid potential financing problems for homeowners were the rental units to be in the same condominium association as the ownership units. Clustering rental units in several buildings would facilitate creation of a separate association and make management of the affordable units, including their maintenance, more efficient. It is noteworthy that the Township affordable housing consultant, Piazza & Associates, which in other municipalities manages affordable units, supports the clustering provision for these reasons.*

*Lastly, as with the fiscal impact report and the court order protecting the Township from any additional affordable housing obligation generated by the project, the Township has responded to the Planning Board recommendation by negotiating an amendment to the ordinances providing that the 18 for sale affordable units will not be subject to the clustering provision and must be more evenly dispersed through the project. The Township Attorney has advised that the change in the ordinance text, limiting clustering to rental affordable units, is not substantial and may be voted upon by Council without the need for re-introduction.*

4. "[W]ith respect to Ordinance 2011-16, the Board finds that, although not a consistency issue, the proposed changes with regard to the minimum required parking spaces presents a risk that the Board may not be able to insure that the site will be able to accommodate the peak demands for parking and that Council should follow the recommendations of the Board's traffic consultant and require a minimum of 1.5 space per unit. The site plan process builds in some flexibility on the issue and the developer will be entitled to make the case for fewer spaces should it determine that the requirements result in excess capacity based on future traffic studies to be submitted as part of the site plan review process."

*Response: As the Board noted, the reduction in the parking ratio is not inconsistent with the Master Plan.*

*While the Board indicates that future traffic studies can be used as the basis for a reduction in the ratio, Council is satisfied that reducing the parking ratio from 1.5 spaces per unit to 1.4375 spaces per unit is reasonable. Several studies show that 1.15 to 1.2 parking spaces are provided in transit oriented development. The Institute of Traffic Engineers Parking Generation report, the most respected source of standards in this area, indicates that 1.2 spaces per unit are sufficient. John Madden has opined that 1.0 spaces per unit would be sufficient.*

*One of the most effective ways of limiting residential traffic in District 1 is to limit parking, as is done, for example, in Jersey City. That limitation will result in a self-selection process, whereby households needing more parking will look elsewhere for housing if parking is not available. Since on-street parking will be metered and the closest other parking is in commuter lots, occupants will have no choice but to limit the number of cars to the available number of parking spaces.*

*Lastly, while it has been noted during the public portion of the hearing on introduction of the ordinances that reducing the parking requirement generates a financial benefit to the developer, that benefit, given in recognition of the cost of providing the additional affordable units, is substantially less than the income lost when converting 58 units from market to affordable units. The benefit is a small fraction of that loss.*

5. "[W]ith respect to proposed Ordinance 2011-17, the Board finds that the proposal of a new zone with characteristics, goals and objectives which are currently not included in the Township Master Plan is inconsistent with the Master Plan. The West Windsor Master Plan does not provide any basis or rationale for establishing the "PM-P District" contemplated by proposed Ordinance 2011-17."

*Response: Ordinance 2011-17 amends Ordinance 2011-04, which the Board did not indicate was inconsistent with the Master Plan, and gives the developer a reasonable assurance that the regulatory system supporting its project will not be eliminated in the unlikely case that the Redevelopment Plan and its codifying ordinance provisions are struck down as a result of litigation brought by a third party. The Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, which noted that the Council was in the process of creating a redevelopment plan, and the Land Use Element were adopted before the Redevelopment Plan was prepared. The Master Plan, therefore, could not be crafted in a way that would provide for the zone created by Ordinance 2011-17, and*

*the Master Plan has not been updated since the  
Redevelopment Plan was adopted.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Township Clerk record this Resolution in the minutes of the Council meeting in accordance with the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law and Municipal Land Use Law.

Ms. Cayci outlined the resolution before the Council and reviewed the Planning Board recommendations.

Ms. Geevers reviewed her comment pertaining to the recommendations made by the Planning Board.

Mr. Borek advised that if the resolution was approved it would then be in conflict with the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Morgan noted his support for the resolution.

Ms. Ciccone explained that Council's concerns and issues were addressed in the ordinances presented. She advised that she does not support the resolution.

President Khanna also noted that he does not support the Planning Board's recommendations.

Motion to approve Resolution 2011-R183: Ciccone

Second: Geevers

RCV: aye Borek  
aye Ciccone  
aye Geevers  
NAY Morgan  
aye Khanna

Motion to adopt Ordinance 2011-16: Borek

Second: Ciccone

RCV: aye Borek  
aye Ciccone  
aye Geevers  
NAY Morgan  
aye Khanna

2011-17 AN ORDINANCE CREATING A MIXED USE PRINCETON JUNCTION  
TRAIN STATION DISTRICT AND AMENDING CHAPTER 200 OF THE  
CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF WEST WINDSOR (1999)- Amending  
Ordinance 2011-04

Ms. Cayci reviewed the details of the ordinance.

President Khanna opened the public hearing.

Motion to close public hearing: Borek

Second: Morgan

RCV: aye Borek

aye Ciccone

aye Geevers

aye Morgan

aye Khanna

Motion to adopt: Borek

Second: Ciccone

RCV: aye Borek

aye Ciccone

aye Geevers

NAY Morgan

aye Khanna

CONSENT AGENDA

MINUTES

August 1, 2011 - Business Session as amended

August 15, 2011 - Business Session as amended

BILLS & CLAIMS

Motion to approve consent agenda: Borek

Second: Ciccone

RCV: aye Borek

aye Ciccone

aye Geevers

aye Morgan

aye Khanna

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ADMINISTRATION

2011-R184 Authorizing the Application to the Local Finance Board Pursuant to NJSA 40A2-51 Requesting Approval for Refunding Bond Ordinance to Advance Refund Outstanding Debt

2011-R185 Authorizing the Mayor and Clerk to Execute a Two-Year Contract with Aquatic Service Inc. for Services and Maintenance to the West Windsor Aquatic Complex from September 19, 2011 through Labor Day 2013-\$79,500

Ms. Louth noted that the Township is refinancing for a better interest rate which results in a saving of over \$100,000.

Motion to approve 2011-R184 and 2011-R185: Morgan

Second: Borek

RCV: aye Borek

aye Ciccone

aye Geevers

aye Morgan

aye Khanna

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES

2011-20 REFUNDING BOND ORDINANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF WEST WINDSOR, IN THE COUNTY OF MERCER, NEW JERSEY PROVIDING FOR THE REFUNDING OF CERTAIN GENERAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS FOR 2005 APPROPRIATING \$3,950,000 THEREFOR AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF \$3,950,000 REFUNDING BONDS OF THE TOWNSHIP FOR FINANCING THE COST THEREOF

Motion to introduce: Morgan

Second: Ciccone

RCV: aye Borek

aye Ciccone

aye Geevers

aye Morgan

aye Khanna

Ms. Young announced that the Public Hearing for this ordinance will be at the Business Session of October 3, 2011.

Mr. Morgan asked that an amendment to the temporary and political sign ordinance be added to the agenda for discussion.

2011-21 AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 200, SECTION 200-152 OF  
THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF WEST WINDSOR (1999)  
PERTAINING TO TEMPORARY POLITICAL SIGNS

Mr. Morgan advised that the amendments to the ordinance are to address the issues within the current ordinance. He proceeded to outline the changes.

Mr. Borek noted that the changes to the ordinance will not be effective for this November Election.

Mr. Hary advised that the suggested amendments would create more signage throughout the Township during Elections.

Ms. Ciccone commented that limiting the number of signs in the right-of-way is a good measure.

Mr. Hary suggested looking into ordinances from other Townships to assist with amendments.

Ms. Ciccone suggested a timeframe for political sign placement and retrieval.

Mr. Morgan offered additional language to the ordinance for adding a timeframe of October 1<sup>st</sup> through seven days after the Election for the placement of signs.

Motion to introduce: Morgan

Second: Ciccone

RCV: aye Borek

aye Ciccone

NAY Geever

aye Morgan

aye Khanna

Ms. Young announced ordinance will be provided to the Planning Board for review and comment.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion of Best Practices Worksheet CY2011

Council acknowledged the receipt of the Best Practices worksheet and corresponding information.

Council had no questions pertaining to the worksheet.

COUNCIL REPORTS

Mr. Morgan spoke about the proposed concept plan for the parking lot that is being discussed by the Parking Authority. He noted that the parking lot will provide over 650 additional spaces.

Mr. Hary advised that the concept plan will go before the Planning Board some time in November. He explained that the Township will lease the property to the Parking Authority and outlined the details of the conceptual phase.

Ms. Geevers spoke of the approved application of Bobby's Burger Palace reviewed by Planning Board.

Ms. Ciccone spoke of the Sustainable New Jersey training session at the Farmers' Market scheduled for October 1, 2011.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. John Church, 11 Princeton Place, made additional comment concerning the redevelopment costs that impact the financial analysis.

Mr. David Siegel, 17 Berrien Avenue, made additional comments with reference to the sign ordinance and spoke of enforcement of the ordinance.

Mr. Bryan Maher, 135 Penn Lyle Road, asked about the effective date for the revisions to the sign ordinance. He spoke in favor of the proposed concept plan for the additional parking, although he noted that an increase of the parking fee is not appropriate.

Mr. Greg Harris, 16 Piedmont Drive, spoke about the sign ordinance, the pool contract with Aquatic Services, and the concept plan for the parking lot.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn: Borek  
Second: Ciccone  
VV: All approved

The meeting was adjourned at 10:46 p.m.

---

Sharon L. Young  
Township Clerk  
West Windsor Township