



JON S. CORZINE
Governor

State of New Jersey

Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council
100 North Road (Route 513)
Chester, New Jersey 07930-2322
(908) 879-6737
(908) 879-4205 (fax)
www.highlands.state.nj.us



JOHN R. WEINGART
Chairman

EILEEN SWAN
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

To: Natural Resources Committee
Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council

From: Eileen Swan, Executive Director
Jim Hutzelmann, Water Resource Engineer
Erin Lynam, Resource Management Specialist
Christine Ross, Senior Resource Management Specialist

Date: January 12, 2008

RE: Application Type: *Proposed Amendment to Upper Delaware WQMP*
Name: *Huntington Knolls*
Municipality: *Holland Township*
County: *Hunterdon*
Highlands Act Area: *Planning Area*
LUCM Location: *Conservation Zone and Conservation Constrained Sub-Zone*
Property: *Block 24, Lots 3 and 13*
Proposed Use: *Age-restricted housing, Institutional Use, Commercial and Office Space*
Nearest Waterway (Name): *Spring Mills Brook*
Wastewater: *Public Wastewater Collection and Treatment (Milford STP)*
Water: *Public Community Water System (Aqua New Jersey, Inc.)*

In early December, the Highlands Council staff performed the Regional Master Plan (RMP) consistency review for the proposed Holland Township WMP amendment (Upper Delaware WQMP) for the Huntington Knolls Condominiums for Block 24, Lot 3 & 13 in Holland Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey. On December 6, 2007 the Natural Resources Committee considered and concurred with the staff recommendation that this amendment should not be adopted by NJDEP, voting to forward the recommendation to the full Highlands Council. The applicant was notified of the meeting but was not represented.

During the review of the application file, Highlands Council staff did not have an electronic or paper copy of the applicant's proposed site plan or footprint of disturbance. When applications are missing this information, during this interim review phase before the RMP is adopted, the Highlands Council performs the review for the entire site parcel(s).

After the December 6, 2007 Natural Resources Committee Meeting, the Highlands Council sent the Natural Resources Committee Meeting Chair Report, the Highlands Staff Recommendation, and Review Checklist to service list which included the applicant and other interested parties. Upon receiving the information, the applicant called the Highlands Council on December 28, 2007 and advised that he and his professionals would be submitting documentation to rebut the Highlands Staff Recommendation. The applicant submitted a hard copy site plan on January 8, 2008, with no further information. Highlands Council staff visually compared the hard copy site plan to the GIS review of the entire site parcel. Because an electronic copy has not been used in this review, all site inconsistencies with the RMP are visually estimated.

After comparing the Huntington Knolls hard copy site plan with our GIS review for resource constraints, it was determined that the proposed development will infringe on:

- Highlands Open Waters (HOW) 300-foot buffers;
- Portions of steep slopes;
- Portions of the riparian area of Spring Mills Brook (FW2TP-C1);
- A high integrity forested subwatershed; and
- Portions of mapped critical wildlife habitat for Cooper's Hawk (State Threatened).

Additionally, the proposed development includes a road that would bisect the mapped critical habitat onsite. The site is entirely within the Agricultural Resource Area. The proposed site plan does not appear to cluster development on 20% of the site with an 80% dedication of the site to agriculture or natural resource open space. Clustering to 20% of the total site area (87 acres) would be 17.4 acres of developed area. The proposed site plan indicates the development footprint is approximately 30-35 acres (34-40% of the site). The proposed site plan indicates a dedication of approximately 32 acres (36.4%) of the site to open space.

As a result of the review of the site plan, the Highlands Council Staff reaffirms its recommendation from December that NJDEP deny the proposed amendment.