

DELAWARE AND RARITAN CANAL COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 18 OCTOBER 1988:

TIME:

12:10 - 2:20 pm

DATE:

Wednesday, 18 October 1988

PLACE:

Canal Commission's Office Stockton, New Jersey

ATTENDING:

COMMISSIONERS: Messrs. Kirkland, Zaikov, Pauley, Jessen & Torpey

STAFF:

Messrs. Amon, Dobbs and Mrs. Greenwald Stephen Brower, Deputy Attorney General

GUESTS:

Paul Stern, D & R Canal State Park Larry & Kay Pitt, Canal Society of N.J. John Kraml, Division of Parks & Forestry Eugene Gross, NJ Water Supply Authority Douglas Megill, Lawrence Twp. Planning Board

Ursula Buchanan, D & R Canal Coalition

Dolly Minis, D & R Canal Coalition

Bernard Cedar, Lawrence Twp. Community Development

Leo Laaksonen, Mercer County Planning Board

Rita M. Gallagher, Wyndmoor Associates Deborah Herzog, Wyndmoor Associates John H. Crow, J.H. Crow Company, Inc. Harvey Yesowitz, Harlyn Associates

Bob Rodgers, Orth-Rodgers-Thompson & Associates, Inc.

Rick Kreppel, Lichtenstein & Associates

Barbara Thomsen, Friends of Princeton Open Space

Sam Herzog, Wyndmoor Associates

Jeffrey Freireich, Lawrenceville Associates

William Brach, Attorney, Lawrenceville Associates

Jay Klapper, Lawrenceville Associates

Mr. Kirkland opened the meeting and stated that all applicable provisions of the Open Public Meeting Law of 1976 had been properly met.

PRALLSVILLE MILLS

P.O. BOX 539

STOCKTON, NJ 08559-0539

609-397-2000

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

COMMISSIONERS

Benjamin B. Kirkland Chairman James C. Amon

Martin D. Jessen Vice-Chairman

Donald B. Jones Treasurer

Stuart R. Zaikov Arthur J. Holland Christopher J. Daggett R. William Pauley

Winona D. Nash Frank J. Torpey

MINUTES

Mr. Zaikov moved to approve the minutes of the 28 September 1988 meeting. The motion carried unanimously following Mr. Torpey's second.

Mr. Kirkland welcomed and introduced Stephen Brower to the members of the Commission and the public. Mr. Brower is the Deputy Attorney General who is taking Dorothy Highland's position.

REVIEW ZONE PROJECTS

Mr. Dobbs presented the following B Zone projects to the Commissioners with his recommendation for approval:

88-0939A - New Amwell Manors

88-1630 - National Paper Company

87-1356 - Simsbury East

88-1653 - Volk Realty

88-1690 - KAL Realty

Mr. Dobbs then informed the Commissioners of 88-1690 KAL Real Estate project in North Brunswick. Mr. Dobbs reported that he found that the buildings had been built prior to issuance of a DRCC Certificate of Approval and requested direction from the Commissioners. After some discussion and recommendation that Mr. Amon write a gentle letter to the Mayor of North Brunswick with the Commission's concern over this project being built without Commission approval, Mr. Zaikov moved approval of all the above projects. Mr. Pauley seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

PORT MERCER CROSSING OF THE CANAL

Mr. Amon reviewed the information previously presented to the Commission regarding the proposed new crossing of the canal in the Port Mercer area. He reviewed the several alternatives and concluded by stating that he recommended to the Commission that they take a position which would indicate to the developer and Lawrence Township what their desires are for this area. He recommended that they approve a plan which would close the existing bridge to vehicular traffic, approve a two lane direct crossing of the canal at the bend of Provinceline Road, but require that the existing portions of Provinceline and Quaker Roads that are on the canal's western bank be closed.

Mr. Leo Laaksonen, Director, Mercer County Planning Department, stated that he favored the new crossing as proposed but felt that the existing bridge should be kept open to accommodate Princeton bound

traffic (and traffic coming from Princeton), or that the new crossing should include a third lane and there should be a signalled intersection with the portion of Provinceline that connects with Quaker Road.

Mr. Douglas Megill, Chairman of the Lawrence Township Planning Board, said that Mr. Amon's proposal was completely unacceptable to Lawrence. He said that Lawrence preferred: 1) Closing the existing bridge and including a signalled intersection on Provinceline on the canal's west bank; 2) Keeping both bridges open and closing the portion of Provinceline between the bridges; or 3) Keeping the status quo.

Mr. Jessen asked Mr. Megill if option #3 was Lawrence's "club", and he acknowledged that it was.

Mr. Bob Rodgers, Lawrence Township Traffic Consultant, then gave data on traffic patterns that indicated that closing Quaker Road's access to the east side of the canal would create an unacceptable traffic snarl at the intersection of Princeton Pike and Provinceline Road. He was particularly concerned about traffic coming from Princeton and trying to turn left at that intersection. When he was asked to compare these problems with the existing intersection of Quaker Road and Princeton Pike he said that he could not comment on an intersection outside the area where he consulted.

Mr. Bernard Cedar, Community Development Director of Lawrence Township, spoke strongly against the idea of putting Princeton traffic on Lawrence roads. He too is concerned about the impact on the Princeton Pike intersection.

Mr. William Brach, Attorney for the Yorkshire Village applicant, informed the Commissioners that his client is caught in the middle and suggested that a conclusion be reached that would be in the best public interest. He stated that his client is willing to do whatever is decided upon, but that is not possible when no one can reach the same conclusion.

Mr. Amon stated again that since the Commission's duty is to protect the Canal Park it should evaluate the alternatives from that standpoint. He said that the decision by Lawrence Township to zone for dense development near the park should not cause the Commission to accept harmful consequences to the park in order to avoid harmful consequences to the Lawrence roads or residents along those roads.

Mr. Cedar asserted that Lawrence has recently "down zoned" its northern section.

Mr. Herzog, the client, asked that some solution be reached. He needs to know what to do in order to proceed with the project.

Mr. Jessen said that the most important consideration for the Commission in this case is to relieve Port Mercer of the heavy traffic it is experiencing. He pointed out that Port Mercer is unique and of great value to the Canal Park. He also said that there is value in having roads alongside the canal because most people experience the park from cars, not on foot. He suggested, therefore, that the Commission pass a resolution asserting that it favored the following solutions in the order listed:

- 1. Close the existing bridge and the roads on both banks. Build a new two lane bridge at the proposed location with no intersection on the west bank of the canal.
- 2. Close the existing bridge and build a new three lane bridge at the proposed location with an intersection on the west bank of the canal with a road connecting to Quaker Road.
- 3. Build a new two lane bridge with no intersection on the canal's western bank. Close the portion of Provinceline between the new and old bridges. Leave the old bridge in operation and leave open the portion of Quaker Road on the western bank.
- 4. Retain the status quo.

Mr. Jessen suggested that the resolution indicate that solutions #3 & #4 should be far less desirable than solutions #1 & #2.

Further discussion by all parties followed this suggestion, concentrating on the idea of including or dropping solutions #3 & #4 from Mr. Jessen's list.

Mr. Torpey then moved approval of the two most desirable alternatives, indicating that the Commission prefers to close the existing bridge and build a new one with no intersection on the canal's western bank. The second choice of the Commission is to close the existing bridge and build a new one with an intersection on the canal's western bank.

Mr. Torpey's motion was seconded by Mr. Pauley and passed with affirmative votes from Messrs. Kirkland, Jessen, Torpey, and Pauley. Mr. Zaikov abstained.

Mr. Brower said that he believed the Commission does not have a legal quorum with four members voting and one member abstaining. He was told that an Attorney General's decision on that matter had been

received and that the Commission was assured that a quorum continued with an abstention by a fifth member. Mr. Brower stated that he would like the record to record his disagreement with this.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James C. Amon Executive Director

рg