

**MINUTES
OF THE
CRANBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD
CRANBURY, NEW JERSEY
MIDDLESEX COUNTY**

**MINUTES JUNE 4, 2020
APPROVED ON AUGUST 6, 2020**

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

The regular meeting of the Cranbury Township Planning Board was held via the ZOOM virtual meeting platform on June 4, 2020, at 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Peter Mavoides, Chairman of the Cranbury Township Planning Board, called the meeting to order.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Under the Sunshine Law, adequate notice by the Open Public Meeting Act was provided of this meeting's date, time, place and agenda were mailed to the news media, posted on the Township bulletin Board, mailed to those personal requesting notice, and filed with the Municipal Clerk.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Present Callahan, Karen
Present Gallagher, James
Absent Hamlin, Judson
Present Kaiser, Michael
Present Scott, Matt
Present Spann, Evelyn
Present Stewart, Jason
Present Wittman, Wayne
Present Mavoides, Pete

PROFESSIONALS IN ATTENDANCE

Present Andrew Feranda, Traffic Consultant
Present David Hoder, Board Engineer
Present Trishka Cecil, Esquire, Board Attorney
Present Josette C. Kratz, Secretary
Present Richard Preiss, Township Planner

APPLICATION

**PB324-19 Toll Brothers, Inc. Regency
Block 25, Lot 1, Zone PAR
Corner of Dey Road and Petty Road
Major Preliminary and Final Subdivision and Site Plan**

REPRESENTATIVES:

Richard Hoff, Esquire - Bisgaier Hoff LLC
Jeremy Greene, AIA - Architectural Business Partner for Toll Architecture
Jim Majewski, Division Senior Vice President -Toll Brothers
Jay S. Kruse, P.E. - ESE Consultants
Andy Grover - ESE Consultants
Karl Pehnke, Traffic Eng., Langan Eng.

EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT A-1 Existing Conditions Aerial March 5, 2020
EXHIBIT A-2 Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Colored Rendering
(Original Layout - 174 Lots – dated 03-05-2020)
March 5, 2020
EXHIBIT A-2a Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Colored Rendering
(Revised Layout - 167 Lots – dated 06-04-2020)
June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-3 Township Riparian Exhibit (Original Layout) March 5, 2020
EXHIBIT A-4 Site Plan Alternative Colored Rendering March 5, 2020
EXHIBIT A-5 Township Riparian Exhibit (Alternative Plan) March 5, 2020
EXHIBIT A-6 Off-Site Force Main and Road Improvement (Sheet 1) June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-7 Off-Site Force Main and Road Improvement (Sheet 2) June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-8 Bayhill Floor Plan June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-9 Bayhill Rendering June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-10 Merrick Floor Plan June 4, 2020

EXHIBIT A-11 Merrick Rendering June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-12 Waylen Elite Floor Plan June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-13 Waylen Elite Rendering June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-14 Bridleridge Floor Plan June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-15 Bridleridge Rendering June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-16 Clubhouse Floor Plan June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-17 Clubhouse Exterior Photo 1 June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-18 Clubhouse Exterior Photo 2 June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-19 Clubhouse Interior Photo 1 June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-20 Clubhouse Interior Photo 2 June 4, 2020
EXHIBIT A-21 Clubhouse Interior Photo 3 June 4, 2020

Ms. Cecil sworn in all the Applicant's professionals and the Township's Board professionals.

Mr. Kruse qualifications were carried forward from the last meeting.

Mr. Kruse testified, starting with the overview of the property

Mr. Kruse stated the site was 71.3 acres, located on Dey Road (County Route) and Petty Road within the Planned Adult Residential Zone, currently agricultural use with outbuildings, farmhouse, farm pond, and woodlands. Cedar Brook located on southern boundary, Petty Road (municipal roadway) to the west which was also the Plainsboro/Cranbury boundary and Dey Road (County roadway) to the north. There are several environmental constraints to the property due to the Cedar Brook and the riparian buffer for the farm pond.

Proposed are 167 age restricted single-family residential homes; reduced from 174 lots. Surrounding the farm pond would be large open green space and the remainder of the site remains the same as previously proposed. Overall development proposes a minimum lot size of 8,025 SF. Lot 16 does comply with ordinance and removes a potential variance making this a variance free proposal. The internal roads would be 30-ft wide in compliance with the RSIS and sidewalk on one side of the roadways. There would be a clubhouse with amenities and centralized mail kiosk. An outdoor, in-ground pool area, decorative seating area, tennis courts, bouclé courts, putting green, water feature and flagpoles. Providing 29 parking spaces, 1 space to every 150 SF similar to a retail use. Clubhouse has no full-time employees, only a manager which would be part-time. They could hire a full-time life guard. Remainder of development would have landscaping comprising of 1,000 trees and 10,000 shrubs with new plantings to off-set the 15 trees which would be removed. Toll proposed using trees and shrubs as listed in ordinance and supplemented a few additional species in order to add blooms and color around key amenities. Proposing signage at entrance, two monument signs and small pier signs on island for demarcation. There was originally a guardhouse proposed which has been removed. There would be two wet ponds with fountains with proper safety measures and provide water quality for storm water. Existing water services along Dey Road to run across entire frontage and a 16

inch main on Petty Road to the proposed intersection of proposed Road G. They proposed to connect into both water-mains. The storm water would be compliant with RSIS standards.

Mr. Kruse explained in detail the functionality and proposed uses of the two basins per the NJDEP regulations.

Mr. Kruse continued with testimony on the sewer service and the roadway construction to the development per the settlement agreement between the Township and the Developer, which they indicated they could not deviate from.

Ms. Cecil noted this development was a result of a settlement agreement between Toll Brothers and the Township of Cranbury which detailed the sewer infrastructure and roadway improvements. It was her understanding the professionals are checking the details with the settlement agreement to assure agreement with each.

Mr. Kruse stated there would be sewer collection by 8" gravity mains and small private pump station comprised with 13-ft by 13-ft barn type structure with barn doors to blend into the surrounding rural character.

Mr. Kruse explained the difference between a force main and gravity main. Knowing there was soil concerns they have had testing of sub-soil survey and found there are sassafras and Woodstown soils, commonly known as poor soil types. Developer would assure the storm water system would function adequately.

Mr. Kruse had reviewed and revised most of Mr. Hoder's technical comments of his review letter on May 19, 2020. Using Exhibit A2.a Mr. Kruse pointed out the changes in landscaping which address Mr. Hoder's comments. They removed all the previously proposed disturbance around farm pond and Cedar Brook. They relocated proposed landscaping features elsewhere. Item 3.b on Page 7 of 22 addressed for setting up the parking spaces which was address in testimony. Page 8 of 22, Item 11, G and L for pump station, agreeable to install recommended 'muffin master'. Page 12 of 22, Item 22, B, discussed exiting trees around farm house which cannot be retained but they would be planting ample trees and shrubs to make up for loss off list with additional trees/shrub types as explained. Footprints of buildings would be addressed by architect. Page 14 of 22, Item 3C, there was a private right-of-way which they would research to assure it would not be impacted (right-of-way from 1920). Item 11B, easements of 10-ft of right-of-way for utilities (both sides). Item 14A, sanitary sewer would comply with RSIS standards. Item 32 and 33, dealing with geese grasses – they have provided river rock lap ring around ponds to prevent erosion and deter geese by providing an unstable walking surface. They felt geese grasses would create an unkempt look and maintenance issue. If untouched in testimony the applicant would comply.

Mr. Hoder noted there were a number of items on Page 8 which the applicant said they would adhere. He noted the pump station has a patio deck with fencing to screen items (two pumps) on deck. Does the board want fence only? Or should they be closed in walls with proper ventilation? Mr. Kruse stated the cover would be a green cover in addition to the fencing. They hope they would aid in the visibility. This was a private HOA and trying to keep the cost down for maintaining the pumps.

Mr. Hoder addressed Item 19 for transportation plan for moving soil on and off the site, per the ordinance. Mr. Kruse would provide. Mr. Hoder, regarding Item 32 and 33, the use of rip rap or stone he felt was not as aesthetically pleasing although as useful, but had no objection. Mr. Kruse argued the geese grasses would have an unkempt pond look, which would be mowed down by the HOA.

Mr. Preiss commented to note the initial application the applicant provided two alternatives, however they have now provide an alternate solution with a reduction of lots and thank the applicant for making effort. He asked if they were having a landscape architect. Mr. Kruse said he would be covering the landscaping. Mr. Preiss noted the suggestions have not been taking in consideration. Mr. Hoff felt Mr. Kruse could offer a response. Mr. Preiss asked about 8 parking spaces and 29 were being provided, was number really necessary and could the applicant bank any of those spaces. Mr. Kruse said they are caught a lot in a conundrum and typically 24 parking spaces was usually needed and the extra spaces are provided for the mail kiosk. Mr. Preiss asked about Petty Road and mail boxes for the residents of Plainsboro on the Cranbury side; are the mail boxes going to be relocated. Mr. Kruse they would have to be relocated but they are proposed to be consistent but would speak with USPS about relocating them. Currently they would only be relocated to provide for the widening and Mr. Preiss would defer to the board their preference.

Using Mr. Preiss's letter of May 11, 2020 – which has been available online for public review. Page 4, regarding lot depth. Mr. Preiss said it was a complaint depth and note on plan was incorrect and would be corrected. Mr. Kruse answered yes, correct. Mr. Preiss said they did not address the dimension of fence area around tennis courts and exceeded the 60 ft. x 120 ft. Mr. Kruse said measurement was for a single court so it was 120-ft by 120-ft and complies. Page 5, minimum setback of gatehouse, none would be provided. Mr. Kruse said none would be provided at this time and if added they would be required to amend site plan and return before the board for approval. Building heights and setbacks are in compliance with standards of the ordinance. Recycling and collection method, Mr. Kruse noted they would be handled by the standard trash hauler. Mr. Preiss noted the sign details for clubhouse. Mr. Kruse noted if included would comply, small directional signs where amenities are located. Mr. Hoff noted there was a decorative structure noted on the plans for the guard-house, a monumental pier feature depicted on plans. Mr. Preiss wanted to note the rear patios would be in compliance and if raised more than 2.5 ft. would have to comply with the rear yard setback. Mr. Kruse stated they would comply with the ordinance requirements. Mr. Preiss asked about the pool

mechanical screens. Mr. Kruse stated they would be screened as in Exhibit A.2a. Mr. Preiss asked about the location of mechanical equipment, utility hook-up to the structures, location of air conditioning systems, etc., and screening. Mr. Kruse stated condenser units would be located on side or rear, any other would be interior. Mr. Preiss asked, as a condition, any outdoor equipment in front or side-yard visible by public would be screened to meet the ordinance.

Mr. Preiss addressed landscaping, amenities and minimal impact. All of the housing unit face inward and landscaping was heavy and from roadway make it difficult to see development. He remarked it should be seen from the road and breaks in landscaping should be provided. He said there were suggestion on enhancing landscaping at entrance, outdoor recreational area, supplement wet tolerant trees. Mr. Hoff responded with being able to incorporate by the basins as part of the final designs. Regarding 'gaps' and all a person would be able to see would be the rear of the homes and person with a home with a gap in the landscaping would only see cars passing by. He understood the ordinance by at this locations he couldn't see what would be achieve since no one could see Cranbury from this location. Mr. Hoff said they would work for different planting species but did not want to compromise the view shed of the residence.

Mr. Mavoides, using Four Seasons as an example, and hoped something could be worked out.

Mr. Feranda had comments on access detail cleanup, applicant were fine with. Mr. Feranda mentioned circulation, access comments 1 through 7, which applicant agreed to. Mr. Feranda mentioned internal roadways, A, B, and C, anything to consider for stretches of roadway. Mr. Kruse felt police enforcement would be effective and the curve and stop control would be traffic calming, naturally. Mr. Feranda asked about considering sidewalk on both sides. Mr. Kruse had several comments, about sidewalk not being used, snow removal, connection to amenities, absorption of maintenance cost, etc. Mr. Feranda commented on cul-de-sac by clubhouse. Mr. Kruse, commenting on Road 'D' was intended to be a fully accessible full-time. Mr. Feranda asked about mail kiosk, parking on side of road, number of vehicles expected, and other views on how it would function. Mr. Kruse did not feel it would be intense and more staggered traffic for mail pick-up. Mr. Andrew asked about off-street parking, 418 are required – mentioned with 30-ft wide roadway there could be parking on side of street. Mr. Feranda said for clubhouse, concerned with other facilities and was the 29 spaces adequate especially if used concurrently. Mr. Kruse stated the experience they felt parking was ample. Mr. Feranda asked about trash and deliveries. Mr. Kruse said deliveries to clubhouse would be normal, as in UPS, Amazon, FedEx, etc. Maintenance and landscape would not overlap with activities. Mr. Kruse said they did not propose a sidewalk for Petty Road and use existing sidewalk on Dey Road, purposely to force foot traffic toward Plainsboro where there was more community and connectivity. Mr. Feranda asked about mailboxes on opposite side of Petty Road, knowing it was existing, but concerned for each mailbox there was a crossing of a person across the roadway into another Township; maybe more encouragement moving the mailboxes to the side of the residences. Mr. Kruse said they would make those arguments. Mr. Fernanda mentioned restriping.

Mr. Stewart felt the mailbox issues are interlinked; more traffic due to development and now crossing the street to an area was heavily buffered, whereas was an open farm field he felt the development was creating a more dangerous situation creating more traffic and making those mailboxes less visible. Mr. Stewart also stated a concern with the Road D to the parking area of the clubhouse and the only sidewalk was on north side where more of the development was one the south sign, forcing people to cross at pinch point to cross the roadway. If there was a sidewalk on the south side would reduce the foot traffic crossing pinch point. Mr. Kruse felt those were valid points, but was at end of the parking lot with a 90 degree turn which would slow vehicle traffic down to an almost a stop. They would make sure there was no landscaping would obstruct view. They could look into moving it to the sidewalk to the southern side. Mr. Feranda asked if they could move the proposed section closer to the parking lot to get over quicker then walking on the east side. Mr. Stewart noted it still has everyone crossing at the pinch point, one side or another would have to cross but if on both side neither side would have to cross. Mr. Hoff said they would take a look at, it was a valid suggestions. Mr. Stewart said testimony on trees and asked the ration of trees of recommend list and not on recommended list.

Mr. Stewart asked about the Petty Road improvements, and asked if there would be one consistent top layer and the sewer service pump system and redundancy, which they would build according to the DEP standards with mechanisms to remain functioning at all times. Mr. Stewart asked about earlier testimony to esthetics of pump house and asked they bring photos/pictures of what would look like.

Mr. Kaiser stated he did not think landscaping on Petty Road needed to be lightened up and felt having the landscaping thinned out would be detrimental. However, on Dey Road the landscaping could be lightened up. Agreeable with Mr. Stewart at Road D and looks like it could be problematic. He was also concerned with the location of the pump house and back-up generator and the noise it would make for the neighbors so close to it. Mr. Kruse said the pump station would be kept off 50-ft property line and neighboring property line setbacks; 100-ft from existing home. They would be muffling the sound and redirecting exhaust toward the pond. Mr. Kaiser asked about the size and combustion. Mr. Kruse said it would be natural gas and was not sure of size. Mr. Kaiser was surprised Mr. Hoder did not ask about and asked to see information before this was approved.

Mr. Gallagher asked if the applicant planned on having any environmental professionals testify. Mr. Hoff indicated they did not plan on having environmental testimony. Mr. Gallagher asked about the environmental statement and there the preliminary assessments, he had not seen it. Mr. Hoff said the soils report was given. Mr. Gallagher asked for LSRP and a LOR; if any remediation was required would there be NJDEP oversight. Mr. Hoff said he did not know the answer of that status. Mr. Gallagher asked to see preliminary assessment. Mr. Hoff said they would provide. Mr. Gallagher asked who was responsible for the force main. Mr. Hoff said they were and proper professionals would have to service the line.

Mr. Wittman voiced concern with moving the mailboxes and no reason to have the mailboxes 100-ft away from the residence to get there mail; felt this was a safety concern. The road would be 30-ft and if there are two cars parked on road from each other would still give enough room for emergency service vehicles. Mr. Kruse it would be and would also provide a turning plan. Mr. Wittman agreed with the stone and asked if there would be signage to keep people out of the pond area. Mr. Kruse said they did not generally put up signage. Mr. Wittman was not in favor of thinning out landscaping and also asked about having photo of pump station along with size of generator. He was concerned with sound and smell. Asked about force main and was there increased sound or smell.

Mr. Scott agreed on not thinning out buffer on Petty Road. He agreed with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Feranda about the sidewalk issues, if not was there thought to putting a pedestrian crosswalk? Mr. Kruse felt it would be a sidewalk to now-where. Mr. Scott stated there were bike paths so they eventually go somewhere. He asked was there would be berms frontage on Petty Road. Mr. Kruse said there would be small berms. Mr. Scott asked about the lighting and asked about uniform lighting, energy efficient, and provide good pedestrian light and asked about LED or _____ lighting. Mr. Kruse said he would investigate lighting suggestion. Mr. Scott asked about the other half of road construction and to what extent it would be repaved. Mr. Kruse explained they were going to patch sections were substandard, however, from numerous comments made they have factor in a large portion of the roadway was substandard. Mr. Scott asked how he would know it was being adequately done. Mr. Kruse said Township Engineer would be overseeing to assure we were meeting the standards.

Mr. Hoder stated he has been spoken with Tom Decker and he was already informed with what he needs to do.

Mr. Scott asked about timing of roadway. Mr. Kruse stated it would have to be one of the early improvements, mainly because they need the sewer main construction, hopefully during the summer months. Mr. Kruse mentioned they still have about a year of outside approvals to obtain. Mr. Kruse said the details are within the design documents, albeit a little difficult to see.

Ms. Spann was confident the road would be performed within the terms of the settlement agreement. She agreed about the one sidewalk provided, and not an additional sidewalk on Petty Road. She felt less sidewalks were better as long as there was a route. She asked about clubhouse capacity, she agreed with the 29 parking spaces. Mr. Kruse thought the clubhouse capacity would be 85 persons. Ms. Spann stated Cranbury does not take signage lightly. She mentioned landscape breaks and agreed with the buffer but wanted the applicant to look at the scenic corridor around Lots 29 thru 32 because they are setback and allow to view how beautiful those houses are. She asked if the Plainsboro residents were noticed; Mr. Hoff said anyone within 200-ft were noticed. She wondered if those persons knew what was involved with their mailboxes. While the USPS could be inflexible she felt there were enough reasons to take them into consideration and if the Township could did anything to support we would did so, feeling it

would be a nightmare for those residences. She asked for pictures for the pump stations. She agreed with Mr. Scott with regard to the lighting.

Mr. Preiss stated his letter had comments on the EIS and Community Impact Statement. Mr. Hoff said they would make amendments before the last hearing.

FLOOR OPENED TO PUBLIC

Mr. Paul Mullen, 102 North Main Street, Chair of EC but speaking as a private citizen. He asked about Petty Road construction, reading from settlement agreement and diagram of full roadway reconstruction with detail stating a full width construction, stating this road needs to be wider than 18-FT. Mr. Mullen pointed out the applicant has changed what they are required by settlement to complete and asked where they got the right to change the legal settlement agreement, Page 4 and Page 14, regarding the full roadway reconstruction. He felt the road should be wider than 18-ft. The submitted plans only shows partial roadway reconstruction.

Mr. Victor Abdiel asked about one way entrance during construction.

Mr. Kruse stated, as they go through construction, this development would become occupied so they are trying to not have all vehicles come in one entrance and move pass homes under construction with vehicles in the street for framers and other dry-wall shipments going to the homes being built.

Ms. Walter Ornberg had a number of concerns with the location of the pump house, decibels of noise from the pump house, and odors. It was discussed at the rear of his property would not receive any plantings because of the rip rap. At the front of his house has never been repaved, Plainsboro did an eight foot strip on the other side of the road because Cranbury did not want to put money into it and never paved and only received cold patch.

Mr. Kruse said yes, the road in front of Mr. Ornberg's home would be reconstructed.

Mr. Ornberg asked about the planting in the rear. Mr. Kruse stated, on Exhibit A-2a, the landscaping they would remove and remained of landscaping shown on plan would remain and as discussed, understanding the concerns of the pump station and its proximity, was taking the landscaping has to be removed and locating along your common property boundary to create a 50-ft wide, instead of a 20-ft wide landscape buffer which was double then what was required.

Mr. Ornberg asked if could not be moved up to equal to the middle of the pond. Mr. Kruse stated the need the space for the pond to handle the storm water management and the pump station must be 50-ft off the road. Mr. Ornberg said put it behind the houses your building, let them deal with the noise. Mr. Kruse stated it had to be as downstream as possible.

Ms. Pamela Ornberg stated her concerns also with the noise of the pump station and the landscaping. Mr. Kruse showed where the landscaping was to be removed because of the Township Riparian Zone, they are not disturbing anything would be changed in the area and would become over grown with natural grasses and moved to the side property line. Ms. Ornberg asked about directly behind her property and would be planting on your side down to where line was. Mr. Kruse said yes, portion would remain. Ms. Ornberg asked if would be on a slight hill or planted flat (berm). Mr. Kruse stated it would be kept at grade level as not to change the drainage flow away from the house, but there could be an elevated berm there, which made Ms. Ornberg feel better.

Mr. Maryann Gear, Plainsboro residents, questioned who has notified Plainsboro Township and they belong to an HOA (Gentry Homeowners Associates) and have they been notified; it would impact the HOA rules and mailing. Mr. Hoff explained they are provided a list from Plainsboro of all those within 200-ft of this property. Mr. Hoff stated the Township Clerk was provided notice.

Michael Pisauero, Watershed Institute, stated he had about a half of dozen questions. He asked Mr. Kruse about storm water management and the talk about the pump house, where the plan referred to drainage area point of interest No. 3, .36 acres of impervious surface. Mr. Kruse said for Point of Interest No. 3. He asked about Point of Interest No. 1 on the eastern side along the lower houses on Exhibit A-2a, none of them are getting water quality/quantity or recharged. Mr. Kruse stated they would have a collection system would be proposed in the rear yard of those lots and would be capture and placed in Pond #2 to capture those rear yard areas. Mr. Pisauero asked, for the recharge trenches, and stated he looked through the soil logs and asked if there were any infiltration or permeability tests done. Mr. Kruse stated he believed the soil test pits were performed. Mr. Kruse stated they did test pits and would have to have a conversation with the soil scientist about the infiltration rates. Mr. Pisauero noted he did not see an overlay with the test pits with the storm water management systems. Mr. Kruse stated his test pit plan were done closest to the recharge area to confirm the soils were adequate, they may not be exactly but they are in proximity. Mr. Kruse stated none were located in a season high water table only met the requirements for separation. Mr. Pisauero, referring to Wet Pond A, asked if they were able to did test pits within Pond A, because they did not 'jive' with any of the plans and asked if there were any test pits in Basin A or B.

Mr. Mavoides asked how many more questions Mr. Pisauero had. Mr. Pisauero stated about a half of dozen or so. Mr. Mavoides suggested he submit those questions directly to Mr. Kruse. He wanted to get the public a change to ask their questions. Mr. Pisauero said he would submit those questions. Mr. Hoff stated he was going to suggest that also.

Mr. William Bauder asked if they could tell him why there were no storm water inlets on the entrance to the Lenape Court side of Petty Road in the area opposite Intel 14. He asked if they could consider a remedy for drainage problem presently exists, Lenape Court was a private

common driveway and not a dedicated Road and floods due to the road draining to the north which ultimately drains to the Cedar Brook drains to undersized culverts at the bridge which floods 71 days out of 365 in 2018. There appears there was no provision to direct the storm water from the crown of the road away from Lenape Court. As a common driveway it should be something that should be considered. He then asked what the comments of Mr. Preiss and safety of the road is widened was not addressed. Lastly, he asked if he missed a direct answer regarding the full width roadway reconstruction vs. half-width repair. He stated he only had paperwork indicating a full width roadway reconstruction; nothing indicated half-width.

Mr. Kruse stated they were keeping most of the drainage, as understood on the other side of the driveway (southern side). Inlet 14, they provided inlets on side and if there continues to be drainage problems on the other side and the Township Engineer determines area needs to be addressed they would consider placing another inlet on the other side to connect them.

Mr. Bauder stated if they look at the die cast was shown shows the sheet flow one would be able to see in public exhibit he presented to them and would be wise to address because, not being a dedicated street, and the preexisting drainage problems as well as adding additional water to the north which would ultimately go to the Cedar Brook should be a consideration during the design process.

Mr. Bauder stated in Mr. Preiss's memorandum of February, which stated the road would be safer and more easily driven if it was widened and does not seem to be addressed and was inconsistent with the Master Plan. He said he wondered what could be done to improve because the reduced width creates a situation where the shoulder was driven on a regular basis and they see the impacts of by the additional sedimentation in the inlets and the drainage system presently existing. The Township has failed to comply with the MS4 permit and he cannot see how would change, as far as cleaning and maintain those, so he was concerned with how could be remedied by an additional width on the road and could the township participate somehow or other to proper widening width.

Mr. Hoff stated the agreement provides for the repair, in accordance with the settlement agreement, and would not widen the road and would resurfaced and reconstructed in areas as needed as Mr. Kruse testified. They were not providing any expansion of the roadway.

Mr. Bauder asked if he missed a direct answer regarding the full width roadway reconstruction. The half-width based on paperwork and documents he has which show full-width roadway reconstruction.

Mr. Kruse stated the exhibit was for areas they found to be sub-standard and wouldn't meet the requirements within the agreements and those areas would be repaired to meet the standard. It may not meet the entire roadway meets the standard and may be areas of sufficient pavement thickens and sub-grade was adequate all you need to did was mill and resurface the top and

could reuse what was out there. Mr. Kruse stated he agreed the road was in disrepair and Toll has planned and priced accordingly to potentially repair the entire roadway at the full depth, but felt was not necessary given the extent to areas were sufficient.

Mr. Hoff stated any off-tract improvement would be under supervision of the Township Engineer. Mr. Kruse stated would be correct.

Mr. Hoff followed up on a former question about the HOA being noticed and he stated he has found out they were provided noticed because of common property owned within 200-ft.

Mr. Mavoides stated he was adjuring the meeting and would be scheduled on July 9th (moved because for the holiday week).

Mr. Hoff asked, as a point of procedure, he stated because of the Zoom platform was he would have to get a new Web ID and a new registration number and suggested be provided on the Township's website so members of the public know here and right now for the July 9, 2020 meeting they need to refer to the Township website and information would be made available in the same spot where they found the documents for tonight's meeting. They would update and provide the information to dial in and participate.

MS. Cecil asked how far in advance to have information.

Mr. Hoff stated he would provide the information for tomorrow.

Ms. Kratz stated she would provide the information for this meeting.

Upon a motion made and seconded the meeting adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded, and carried, the meeting was thereupon adjourned.

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY

I, the undersigned, did at this moment certify;

I am duly elected and acting secretary of the Cranbury Township Planning Board and the other minutes of the Planning Board, held on June 4, 2020, consisting of 13 Pages, constitute a true and correct copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

IN WITNESS of which, I have hereunto subscribed my name to said Planning

Planning Board Meeting for June 4, 2020
Page 13 of 13

Board this August 6, 2020.

Josette C. Kratz, Secretary

/jck