Bedminster Planning Board regular meeting notes

Pg. 1
The Planning Board of the Township of Bedminster met in regular session on this date. Members present were Chairman Fales, Messrs. Field, Kean, Smith and Winkler. Others present were Counsel Bowlby and the Secretary.

On motion, the minutes of the previous meeting of February 25, 1963 were approved as submitted, no one in attendance desiring said minutes read.

The following applications for approval of a subdivision of land were considered at this meeting:

P.B. 63-16^4

The application of Elizabeth Stevens Ballentine for approval of a subdivision of land located on the easterly side of Union Grove Road, Bedminster Township, N.J. was further considered by the Board. The Secretary advised that notice of a public hearing has been duly advertised for this date and that certification of service of notice on all adjoining property owners by Certified Mail has been received; the preliminary plat map has been filed with percolation test results indicated thereon; the final filing fee has been paid and remitted to the Township Treasurer; the Township Engineer has checked the preliminary plat and has advised, by phone, that said plat is in order and no further comments have been received from the County Planning Board.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing on this application. Hearing no comments from those in attendance, the Chairman declared the hearing closed.

The Board questioned Mr. Edwin Brown, authorized agent for the applicant, as to how owners of the proposed lots would enter a public road. Mr. Brown stated that Lots 1A, 1B and 1C would be entered from Union Grove Road; Lot 1E from Daly Road and Lots 1F and 1G from State Highway No. 206. Mr. Brown advised that he has been in correspondence with the New Jersey State Highway Department and has been advised that, upon final approval and sale of the lots, the owners must apply to the State Highway Department for access permission. A copy of Mr. Brown's letter to the New Jersey State Highway Department and that department's reply is on file with the Secretary of the Planning Board.

Mr. Smith advised that the percolation test results are satisfactory since they are above the minimum standards. Mr. Craig, engineer for the applicant advised that the test holes were 30 inches in depth. He further advised that there would be no problem as to water supply from wells.

Mr. Craig was questioned as to whether a drainage easement would be run through Lots 1E and 1F. He stated that he has not had an opportunity to discuss this question with the applicant or her attorney.

Chairman Fales advised that monuments should be placed to delineate each lot in the subdivision. He also advised that the ordinance requires the planting of grass, trees and shrubs.

Counsel Bowlby stated that the drainage easement should be shown on the final map and should cross Lots 1E, 1F and 1G.

It was regularly moved, seconded and carried that said application be approved as a major subdivision and that the applicant be directed to comply with the further provisions of the ordinance governing the subdivision of land, including the filing of a complete final map designating proper drainage easements and compliance with the above mentioned recommendations of the Planning Board.

P.B. 63-165

The application of Sterling Security Corporation, 382 Springfield Avenue, Summit, N.J. for approval of a subdivision of land located on the southerly side of Pottersville Road, Pottersville, N.J. and consisting of one parcel to be subdivided into 27 lots, all according to a map or plan made by Arnhammer, Jeske & Arnhammer, Engineers, Summit, N.J. and dated February 5, 1963, Revised March, 1963 was considered by the Board. The applicant was represented by Carroll A. Boynton, Esq.

The Secretary advised that the initial filing fee has been received, copies of the maps (sketch) have been forwarded to the Township Engineer and the County Planning Board. The Township Engineer has advised, by phone, that the sketch plat does not show existing structures or wooded areas. The County Planning Board has made no comment, by letter, as of this date.