

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

**MINUTES AUGUST 4, 2022
APPROVED ON SEPTEMBER 1, 2022**

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

The regular meeting of the Cranbury Township Planning Board was held via Zoom <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86494062397> Meeting ID: 864 9406 2397 on August 4, 2022, at 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Michael Kaiser, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Adequate notice as well as electronic notice of this meeting were provided in accordance with the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act and the regulations governing remote public meetings. The notice included the time, date and location of the meeting and clear and concise instructions for accessing the meeting. A copy of the agenda for this meeting was made available to the public for download on the Township's website, and all documents and other materials pertaining to any applications listed on the agenda were posted electronically and made available for download at least forty-eight hours prior to the meeting.

All participants in this meeting are required to keep their microphones muted until recognized or directed otherwise. The Board will engage the Zoom "mute" function until the time for public comment is reached.

Members of the public who wish to make a comment are required to use the "Raise Hand" feature in Zoom, or, if participating by telephone, by pressing *9. Once recognized by the chair, the participant will be able to unmute his or her microphone and offer a comment. Interested parties wishing to ask a question or make a comment during a public hearing on an application will be sworn in and asked to provide their name and address before proceeding. The Board Chair or his designee will manage the order of the comments.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

- ☒ Ferrante, Michael
- ☒ Gallagher, James
- ☐ Gittings, Bill
- ☐ Jones, Dominique
- ☒ Kaiser, Michael

- ☐ Mavoides, Peter
- ☒ Spann, Evelyn
- ☐ Stewart, Jason
- ☒ Wittman, Wayne

PROFESSIONALS IN ATTENDANCE

- ☒ David Horner, Traffic Engineer
- ☒ David Hoder, Board Engineer
- ☒ Elizabeth Leheny, Township Planner
- ☒ Robert Davidow, Esquire, Board Attorney
- ☒ Robin Tillou, Planning Board Administrative Officer

DISCUSSION

Chair Kaiser asked the Planning Board Members if any member have input on the hotbox discussion.

Ms. Spann stated there was conversation and there are still conversations of whether hotboxes would be considered structures. It was determined hotboxes would be considered structures.

Mr. Davidow stated as per ordinance 150-11 C., it does state that hotboxes are structures.

RESOLUTIONS

**PB358-22 J-Star Research
5 Cedar Brook Drive
Block 1, Lot 7.03 – Zone RO/LI
Preliminary and Final Site Plan – Amendment**

Ms. Spann stated Page 10 of 11 in the resolution refers to deicing materials and the repair of any damage done to Duncan Drive. This is not appropriate to put in the resolution. The applicant does not have any say of what happens on Duncan Drive.

Mr. Davidow stated he reviewed this with council and the applicant did not object to that.

MOTIONED TO APPROVE: Ms. Spann

SECONDED: Mr. Gallagher

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Gallagher, Ms. Spann, Mr. Wittman and Mr. Kaiser

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

MOTION PASSED

PB356-22 WuXi Biologics, USA
Block 1.02, Lot(s) 2-7, Zone RO/LI
7 Clark Drive
Preliminary and Final Site Plan Amendment

MOTIONED TO APPROVE: Mr. Gallagher

SECONDED: Mr. Wittman

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Gallagher, Ms. Spann, Mr. Wittman and Mr. Kaiser

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

MOTION PASSED

APPLICATION

PB325-19 Cranbury Station Road, LLC c/o Summit Associates, Inc.
Block 13, Lot(s) 13, 15 & 16, Zone I-LI
Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road
Preliminary and Final Site Plan / Subdivision

REPRESENTATIVES: Michael Vitiello, Esq., Giordano, Halleran & Ciesla
 John Visceglia, SAI Real Estate
 Clint Miller, Applicant's Engineer, Hammer Engineering
 Joseph Hanrahan, Applicant's Engineer, Hammer Engineering
 Andrew Janiw, Applicant's Planner, Beacon Planning
 John Rea, P.E., Traffic Consultant, MRA Traffic
 Ed Kuc, Eastern States Environmental Associates
 Joe DiGiorgio, ARCO Design/Build Industrial
 Brian Cramer, Greenvest, Environmental Consultant

EXHIBITS:

A-1 – Aerial Exhibit of Property and Surrounding Area

A-2 – Colorized Landscape Plan

A-3 – Sanitary Sewer Force Main Exhibit

A-4 – Alternate Layout Exhibit showing how to further enhance the vegetative areas

A-5 – Existing and Proposed Cross Pond Sections

A-6 – Aerial Exhibit - Aerial Image of Property and Surrounding Area

A-7 - Site Layout Rendering

A-8 – Sheet A01 - Building 1 – Conceptual Floor Plan – 07/08/22

A-9 – Sheet A02 - Building 1 – Concept Exterior Elevations - 07/08/22

A-10 – Sheet A03 - Building 1 – Site Sections - 07/08/22

A-11 – Sheet A04 – Building 2 - Conceptual Floor Plan - 07/08/22
A-12 – Sheet A05 – Building 2 - Conceptual Exterior Elevations – 07/08/22
A-13 – Sheet A06 – Building 2 – Site Sections – 07/08/22
A-14 – A07 – Conceptual Perspective View Building 1 Entrance – 07/08/22
A-15 – A08 – 7/8/22 - Conceptual Perspective View Halsey Reed Road
A-16 – A10 – Finish Sample Presentation – 07/08/22.

Mr. Davidow announced he has reviewed the notice for the application. The notice was adequate, and this Board can take jurisdiction over the application. The applicant has re-noticed due to the change of the subdivision now being titled major subdivision.

Mr. Davidow announced all witnesses remain sworn in from the previous hearing of May 28, 2022.

Mr. Vitiello stated this is a continuation of the public hearing on this application from two prior meetings. The applicant has taken into consideration the Board decisions and comments. At this time, the applicant has revised the plan to accommodate those comments.

Mr. Hanrahan displayed Exhibit A-6 – Aerial Exhibit.

Mr. Hanrahan stated lot 21 is one of the changes made which is the residential lot along Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road. That has now been combined in the project. The subdivision will remain the same except for lot 21 being combined with lot 15 to create a new lot 15.01. The project has been reduced in scale due to establishing the 150 ft. buffer to the farm pond of the north. The applicant has added the 150 ft. buffer to the seasonal pond to the south. The project has been reduced in scale due to the buffers. The bigger building to the north and east has been reduced by 25,000 sq. ft. The smaller building has been expanded by 12,000 sq. ft. because of combining lot 21 to the project. The change to building #2 is it has increased in length by 54 ft. for an expansion of 12,000 sq. ft., the reduction of floor area ratio (FAR) is 13,000 sq. ft. for both buildings. That is a FAR reduction from 0.17 to 0.16. We are 20% less on a FAR basis than what is allowed. The major change to this plan is there is no longer a truck court. This has reduced the impervious coverage of the project. The impervious coverage was previously at 35.4% and is now at 29.9% impervious coverage. That is 5.5% less impervious coverage of what was previously proposed and 40% is what is allowed. Another change to the project is the drive to the northerly building along Halsey Reed Road has been removed. This is referring to the loop drive parallel to Halsey Reed road that has been removed. The access and the circulation are the same except for removing the truck court and the drive along Halsey Reed Road. The parking requirements are met. The landscaping proposed are 483 trees and 458 shrubs. There are 132 trees above the requirement. They are 152 trees above the tract requirements of the code. They are 23 trees above the tree removal requirements. The two truck courts are fenced completely by 8' high chain link black final coated fencing for both buildings. Another change is the farm pond will no longer be used as a retention basin. The detention

basins have 4' high split rail fencing. They have three bio detention basins which will be planted up to conform with NJDEP regulations. The whole project conforms to the water quality and to detention requirements with the DEP and DRCC. There is proposed porous pavement within the parking stalls, porous concrete for the sidewalks, porous crosswalks and stormwater has been disconnected in some areas through sheet flow and swales. The water quality devices will comply with the DRCC and DEP stormwater regulations. The signage is like what was previously testified to. Two project identification signs at each driveway along Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road which is 10' wide by 6' high round mounted signs. There are three directional signs that are 2.3' wide by 5' high. There is an existing variance for lot(s) 15 and 21 due to those lots not currently having frontage along Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road because of being along the rail line, however there is access through the rail line. The waivers being proposed are the loading docks due to the ordinance requiring 15' wide loading docks, and they are proposing 13' wide loading dock spaces. They are removing the lot that has no frontage from two lots with no frontage to only one lot with no frontage. The project is 20% less than what is allowed for FAR and 25% less than what is allowed for impervious coverage.

Chair Kaiser asked if there will be one waiver and one variance being proposed in the revised plans.

Mr. Davidow advised yes. The frontage variance is existing for the current lot which is a preexisting non conforming condition on the site due to the Conrail line that goes across in front of the line before Halsey Reed Road. And the loading docks being proposed are 13' which will be a design waiver.

Mr. Hoder asked why they are not combining lot(s) 13.01 and 15.01 to get rid of the variance.

Mr. Vitiello stated for financing of the different construction and the ownership. Without that lot line it is not possible to obtain separate financing and there are other ownership issues.

Mr. Wittman stated the Conrail line is blocked off further north as you go in Monroe and they have dead ends on the line, so he is not sure if that line will ever be re-erected again.

Mr. Vitiello acquired to own the property and they stated no.

Mr. Vitiello stated none of the minor subdivision lines have changed. The difference is if lot 21 is merged into those lots.

Mr. John Rea, traffic engineer for the applicant, was sworn in by Mr. Davidow.

Mr. John Rea, McDonogh Ray and Associates, stated he is a licensed professional engineer in NJ and his specialty is traffic engineering with a total of 48 years of experience in the traffic engineering field. He has an undergraduate degree in civil engineering from NJIT and a master's

degree in transportation engineering at NYU. He has presented to the Cranbury Township Planning Board previously.

Chair Kaiser accepted Mr. Rea's credentials.

Mr. Rea stated there are three traffic engineering reports. The original traffic import study was done on September 26, 2019. This study was for the two buildings that were larger than what is being proposed today. The supplement traffic engineer study was on February 8, 2022 which did a traffic count that was for the original 2019 study and updated the traffic counts. The counts were done at the intersection of Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road and Station Road at the intersection. The conclusions that were reached was that the pre-COVID counts were higher than the 2022 counts. There were 600 fewer cars and trucks going through for the 2022 count in the AM peak street hour and 400 fewer vehicles during the PM peak street hour two years later. It was determined that it was appropriate to keep the 2019 study due to being higher counts. The third traffic study supplement was on June 21, 2022 and that supplement was prepared due to the reduction in the square footage of 25,000 sq. ft. The regeneration of the traffic analysis was to make sure they did a conservative or worst-case analysis for the traffic. The conclusion of the traffic studies was still valid. The findings were at the intersection of Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road and Station Road will be a level of service c or better conditions. The level of service b and c are particularly good for central New Jersey and fall well within the level of service parameters. The two site driveways will be the unsignalized driveways and both will operate at a level of service B or better for both morning and afternoon peak hours for the 2023 design year. The total parking meets the municipal requirement of a total of 108 parking spaces for the two buildings in total. The circulation through the site of the two driveways and the parking is adequate. The project will not have an adverse or detrimental impact to traffic conditions to the area.

Mr. Rea stated he takes no exception to anything in Mr. Horner's review. With respect to the signage, there was an issue in the past with the trucks coming off Route 130 and missing the turn to get to the Cranbury Logistics area, as a result, two signs were installed on the east bound approach. The signs constructed were small, if needed to be larger they have no issue making sure their trucks know where the facility is located and make sure they do not go over the tracks and into Monroe.

Mr. Kuc stated in his opinion from an environmental standpoint he is ok with the revised plans. It incorporates his recommendations for the project to not impact lands to the south and southeast. They were putting focus on the farm pond in the northern property. There are ecological values associated to the farm pond that now incorporates the preservation of that plan along with a buffer. The layout regarding the buffering to the contiguous to the south and southwest have incorporated their ponds adding a nice inner mix to the south. It does impact the wetland disturbances. The previous had .64 wetland disturbance. The disturbance will now be reduced to .24 wetland disturbance. There was a general permit 6A which allowed for .07 acres

of disturbance to the buffer to isolated wetlands and they now have no disturbance to the buffer. They had general permit 10A for roadway crossing, with the revised plan they now have 0 acres of wetland disturbance for the purpose of crossing. The only increase was the general permit 11 pertaining to outlaw structure, it was .01 acres of wetlands transition area of disturbance, and now with new plan it will increase to .039 acres. Well within the DEP levels.

Mr. DiGiorgio was sworn in by Mr. Davidow.

Mr. DiGiorgio stated he graduated from Penn State University with a master's in architect and has 15 years of experience in architecture. His license in NJ is in good standing.

Chair Kaiser accepted Mr. DiGiorgio's credentials.

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed Exhibit A-8 – Building 1 – Conceptual Floor Plan – 07/08/22.

Mr. DiGiorgio stated Building 1 will be a one-story building. It will be concrete slab on grade and have steel columns, metal roof, joists, metal deck, roof insulation and roofing membrane. There are load bearing concrete panels on the perimeter and several ingress and egress doors. The designated office will be in the southwest corner of plan. The designated area for the utilities are on the northwest corner of the proposed plan. The accessory and accessible parking is adjacent to the office space. This is roof drainage slopes in two directions. The slope is north to the page and plan south to the page. There will be two rooftop units for this building.

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed Exhibit A-9 – Building 1 – Concept Exterior Elevations - 07/08/22.

Mr. DiGiorgio stated the west elevation is a 36 ft. clear building. The top of the building is 45.3' and the roof bridge line is the middle of the building on grid point E which slopes in both directions, west and east. The right-hand side is the designated office with a series of glazing, punched openings, store front, double height glazing at entrance and a number of canopies. They tend to use a darker base to the bottom then gradually transition to lighter as it goes north. The east elevation is the elevation facing Halsey Reed Road which is a simple and clean elevation. The south elevation is the loading, clear story windows to bring natural light into the space of the building. The loading has horizontal reveals, loading doors and clear story windows to bring natural light into the building. The north elevation that opposes the farm pond and dock wall has clear story windows, a series of paint reveals, architectural reveals and an enhanced corner to enhance the elevation. There are recess panels to create a shadow and compliment the rest of the building.

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed Exhibit A-10 – Building 1 – Site Sections.

Mr. DiGiorgio explained what was being seen on Exhibit A-10. The proposed location of rooftop units will be screened by the panels at the entrances

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed Exhibit A-11 –Sheet A04 – Building 2 Conceptual Floor Plan - 07/08/22.

Mr. DiGiorgio stated building #2 is the smaller of the two buildings with steel columns, metal deck, roofing membrane, loading concrete panels and the fire ingress doors. The proposed office location is in the plan on the northwest corner with the associated ADA stalls adjacent to the office location. The utility location is west on the plan. The loading area is in the plan east with trailer parking. The emergency access road goes beyond the building.

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed Exhibit A-12 – Sheet A05 – Building 2 Conceptual Exterior Elevations – 07/08/22.

Mr. DiGiorgio stated this building is designed like building #1. This is a mini version of building #1. There are architectural reveals and a medium texture of paint. There is darker color at the base and the lighter color going up. The east elevation is like the west elevation. The emergency access road follows. The office is on the right side. The north elevation is two stories of a glazing feature with the canopies and aluminum Molinas and the dock wall has the clear story windows to add natural and daytime light to the loading space. There are five paint colors: blue accent color, dark gray, medium gray and two versions of white which are rock candy white and pure white.

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed Exhibit A-13 – Sheet A06 – Building 2 – Site Sections – 07/08/22.

Mr. DiGiorgio explained what was being seen on exhibit A-13. Mr. DiGiorgio stated the rooftop units would be blocked by the location of the rooftop units approximately 60' off the building perimeter and the panels in relation to the roof slope would block the rooftop units.

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed A-14 – A07 – Conceptual Perspective View Building 1 Entrance – 07/08/22

Mr. DiGiorgio stated this is a rendering of what the building will look like and its associated vegetation and landscaping throughout the site. The drive aisle on the rendering to the left is not a public street, it is an interior drive within the site.

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed A-15 – A08 – Conceptual Perspective View Halsey Reed Road - 07/08/22

Mr. DiGiorgio stated the emergency access road is to the right-hand side and is cut off from the view.

Mr. Hanrahan stated the emergency access road is porous pavement which is open graded

pavement to allow stormwater to run to the subgrade and filtrate into the soil.

Mr. DiGiorgio displayed Exhibit A-16 – A10 – Finish Sample Presentation – 07/08/22.

Mr. DiGiorgio stated this display shows the five colors that are being proposed. The store front systems will be aluminum mullions.

Ms. Spann asked if Mr. DiGiorgio has visited the site.

Mr. DiGiorgio stated he is familiar with the site and has designed buildings on the other side of the turnpike as well.

Ms. Spann asked if it is intentional that the house is not shown that is embedded in the site plan or the homes across the street.

Mr. Vitiello stated it was not intentional.

Andrew Janiw, Beacon Planning, Applicant's Planner was sworn in by Mr. Davidow.

Mr. Janiw stated he has a bachelor's and master's degree in civil engineering from NJIT and is a licensed professional planner in NJ and a member of the Institute of Certified Planners. He has been a principal of Beacon Planner for 24 years. He has testified throughout NJ as an expert Planner.

Chair Kaiser accepted Mr. Janiw's qualifications.

Mr. Janiw stated they have submitted a community impact statement in May 2021 and revised that in July 2022 to reflect the current configuration of the site. The community impact statement addresses matter of impact on population on schools and taxes. The proposed warehouse is benign on those items. The revenues being generated from the taxes outweigh any demand on emergency services.

Mr. Janiw stated lot 15.01 will be seeking a frontage variance. The Conrail line lies between the property and the Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road. This is an existing condition. There will be a crossing provided for the property and on the adjacent property. They are seeking a waiver for the width of the loading spaces where 15' is required and 13' is being proposed. The 13' is an industry standard. The lot frontage is a c or bulk variance for hardship which produces a condition they cannot cure and the second is the positive test (positive and negative criteria) and they qualify for both. There is no real detriment to the operation for the waiver of the truck loading spaces. They are consistent with the Master Plan for the variance and do extend the purpose of the MLUL which is the reason a variance should be considered which is a benefit to the public. The negative criteria are this will not create any detriment to the neighbors, master

plan or zone plan. This will provide adequate and proper access to the site and properly configured.

Ms. Leheny referred to her review letter dated August 1, 2022. Ms. Leheny stated the directional signs were indicated in the site plan. The code permits one directory sign of 16 sq. ft. but if they are directional signs, they cannot exceed 2 sq. ft.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they will comply and have one of the three signs a directory sign for each entry and the other two will be made into directional for each site.

Ms. Leheny stated the landscaping should be considered that was presented in the earlier plan around the pond.

Mr. Hanrahan stated above the farm pond within the 150 ft. buffer of the pond can be added in that area for the buffering and the berm.

Mr. Vitiello stated that would require a variance.

Mr. Gallagher suggested to make it natural vegetation rather than the traditional landscaping that is around the building. Something that would blend in with what is there already and provide a good screen.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they can have their landscape architect work with the professional to pick out the plantings.

Mr. Kuc stated he also recommends natural vegetation.

Ms. Leheny stated this can be worked out as a condition of approval.

Mr. Janiw stated there is no detriment to the zone plan or master plan and is a benefit to the community for the variance in the buffer.

Ms. Leheny stated there are enclosures for generators and transformers, will they still need to go before the Board if there is already the enclosure?

Mr. Davidow stated if there is a pad and no generator, they would still have to come before the Board to provide details of the equipment for site plan approval.

Ms. Leheny wanted to specify that the pad is being approved, not the equipment.

Ms. Leheny stated because the existing lot(s) 21 and 15 have easements which were coordinated with the rail line, now that there is a new lot, is a new easement required?

Mr. Vitiello stated the curb cut near the smaller building will require the necessary approvals from Conrail to improve it and put asphalt down.

Mr. Hoder stated the disturbance definition from the riparian zone is the placement of impervious surface, the exposure or movement of soil or bedrock with clearing, cutting and removing of vegetation. They would need a variance due to moving soil. If this application is approved and the variance is approved for working in the 150 ft. buffer, there should be a short mitigation plan to show the construction methods to make the least amount of disturbance within the riparian zone.

Mr. Gallagher stated that area has already been disturbed.

Mr. Hoder stated the emergency back roadway going out to Halsey Reed Road should be grass pavers. It should have grass growing through it and not porous pavement.

Mr. Vitiello stated the DEP has their hands tied with the porous pavement and is not sure if the grass pavers will be treated the same way. His professionals can see about putting that treatment to the emergency drive.

Mr. Hanrahan stated grass pavers are not an accepted treatment for the standards. It is important to do porous pavement to meet the criteria. Would it be acceptable to the Board if we can make that angled leg of the first 75 ft. grass pavers?

Mr. Hoder stated that would be a good compromise.

Mr. Hoder referred to his review letter dated August 2, 2022. Conservation Easements are now shown on the plan, the deed should be submitted to the Board. No sidewalks are being proposed. Sidewalks could be placed on Halsey Reed Road if the Board sees fit. The plans do not have a wall section of the trash container. Explain what you are going to provide in terms of surface of that trash area and what the walls will look like. The enclosure should be like the building.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they are concrete walls 8' high with material to match the building.

Mr. Hoder stated the plan is missing the pump station with the force main and that should be provided. The shade trees are not consistent toward the larger building. A nice shade tree as per the ordinance should be submitted. The trees are a curved linear right now and should be linear and add 5 or 6 trees along the railroad right of way to define the property line.

Chair Kaiser stated it would be good to add more trees.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they have the trees spread out in a pattern that is not linear. They can make them linear and add trees along that line.

Mr. Hoder stated the railroad can come in at any time and clear that vegetation.

Mr. Horner referred to his review letter dated August 2, 2022. Mr. Horner stated regarding the traffic impact study, he is in agreeance with the methodology using the 2019 count data. Based on the trip generation that they use, it is lower now with the reduced sq. ft. of the budling. The only caution is there are several types of warehouses, and some are more intense than others. The applicant should confirm that this will not be what may turn into a high queue fulfillment center.

Mr. Rea stated if you look at the parking spaces provided, it limits the amount of peak hour traffic that they can generate and puts it in the generic land use code category from the ITE.

Mr. Horner agreed and stated if the parking is not there to support these high queue centers, then the user would not be interested in this site. The truck bays and loading zones are not in the nature of a higher impact warehouse. Mr. Horner would like confirmation that the truck circulation can be demonstrated to come in and turn around properly with the removal of the loading area and the connector of the internal aisle way to connect the truck bays. The removal of the loading area has created a dead-end aisle for the larger building and would like a demonstration there will be no issue due to no circulation around the building.

Mr. Rea stated he will work with Mr. Hanrahan's office to do that. If we lose one or two trailer spaces, they can do that.

Mr. Hanrahan stated there are open loading docks and trailer stalls used in the operation of the warehouses where that can be done. They can remove trailer stalls, stripe it and remove the cross hatched area at the top and put something more centrally located that is crossed out for turn around purposes.

Mr. Horner stated if a trailer is in the furthest stall to the east next to building #1, he would like to make sure they can back in and there is enough room for them to do that. They would be coming out backwards in that location.

Mr. Hanrahan stated that a jockey truck would be put in that location, which is standard.

Mr. Horner stated the building #2 access has concerns due to when they come in that driveway, they must go to the left to get straight in. Restriping should be done to guide traffic.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they will adjust that driveway to eliminate that situation and accommodate.

Mr. Horner stated for truck staging exhibit that was in the electronic package, how can that be monitored so there is never a situation where a truck needs to be on Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road?

Mr. Rea stated they can agree to that as a condition to have no stopping or standing signs along Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road.

Mr. Horner asked how the gate will be operating.

Mr. Hanrahan stated it will be tenant driven, there will be electronic slide gates there. There could be tenant driven details there.

Mr. Horner stated the concern would be there would be operational protocols in place to make sure stacking does not go beyond the site boundaries or block the aisles within the site.

Mr. Gallagher asked if there is any need for additional landscaping to screen the houses to the east and the southeast. Is the natural vegetation thick and high enough to screen those homes?

Mr. Hoder stated the landscaping would be much lower, so it will not be as screened.

Mr. Gallagher is concerned of the houses in the rear of the building.

Chair Kaiser requested vegetation be planted there.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they are meeting the buffer of the code.

Mr. Vitiello stated the type of trees and vegetation are on the plan. They can move some of the plantings into different areas to block the views.

Mr. Wittman requested the distance from the northeast corner to the property line.

Mr. Hanrahan stated it is 343 feet from the northeast corner to the property line to the north.

Mr. Wittman stated Halsey Reed Road does not need a sidewalk and would rather see plantings and berms. It would be beneficial to put in grass pavers for the emergency road, but if DOT overrules that we will have to concur. The plantings should be more detailed. Additional planting east near the vernal pond would start triggering things. Is the lighting going to be discussed?

Mr. Hoder stated the lighting is in accordance with the ordinance. They are complying with the ordinance. The lighting will not be an issue with any surrounding properties.

Mr. Hoder stated the buffer along the mitigation bank is minimal. There is a good tree row along the property line. He still thinks they should supplement the property with evergreens along that property line as per the stormwater to break up the building.

Mr. Miller displayed A-17 street view of Halsey Reed Road

Mr. Hanrahan stated they will edge the property with evergreen trees.

Ms. Spann wanted confirmation that the lighting will not reach the homes to the backside of the property.

Mr. Hoder stated they are 16' high in the back of the property which makes it a 0-foot candle so it will not shine. That could be a condition of the resolution.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they are 25' high (there is a typo on the plans), and that lighting will still be a 0 footcandle and are rear shielded.

Mr. Hoder asked what the couple G and C lights, 50 ft. from the edge of the building further away from Halsey Reed Road are.

Mr. Hanrahan stated the C are fixtures are the light poles and the G are wall packs. The wall packs are 16' high.

Mr. Hoder stated he does not have issues with the wall packs. The last two or three lights on the truck parking area labeled C, can house side shields be put on?

Mr. Hanrahan stated they do have house side shields.

Mr. Hoder stated that should stop the glare towards Halsey Reed.

Mr. Hanrahan stated he will provide details of house side shield.

Mr. Ferrante stated a challenge in town is the parking for drivers, what would be the for those drivers can to sit with their truck without penalty on site.

Mr. Rea stated there will be staging for the large and smaller buildings.

Mr. Hanrahan stated there is substantial staging and there will be plenty of truck parking for staging.

Chair Kaiser stated the fencing enables you an area to stack those trucks from the change in fencing outside the gate.

Mr. Ferrante asked the sequence of having the wetlands mitigation property and a subdivision to tack the 10 acres on this plot of land so they can develop that plot of land and get an impervious surface coverage of less than 40% for the combined space. It feels double dipping in terms of the intent of impervious coverage.

Mr. Davidow stated there is nothing in the code as far as the “double dipping.” That is for the Board to weigh the testimony that was heard pertaining to those issues.

Chair Kaiser stated the grass pavers should be put in to soften that edge and fit better into the neighborhood. What is the height of the chain link fence?

Mr. Hanrahan stated 8’.

Chair Kaiser asked if there will be any soil export.

Mr. Hanrahan stated a net fill to the sight of 60,000 yards is coming into the site. The trucks will come from Route 130, down Station Road, right onto Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road and into the site. There will be signage for the trucks to restrict them from heading further east on Station Road and further south on Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road. The plan is to utilize all the fills and will only have to bring in the 60,000 yards.

Mr. Hoder stated the applicant should provide on their plan what Mr. Hanrahan had described so the trucks do not waiver off to residential roads.

Chair Kaiser asked where the pump station is going to be.

Mr. Hanrahan stated it will be at the northwest corner of the larger building #1. There are design plans for the pump station.

Mr. Hoder asked if the site is located within the planning area for sanitary sewer within Cranbury?

Mr. Hanrahan stated yes.

Chair Kaiser opened the meeting to the public.

Susan Ryan, 9 Prospect St., Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) Chair, read the letter into record that was provided to the Board from the HPC.

Mike Pisauro, Watershed, would like clarification of the underground detention basins or if they have been removed in exchange for the bioretention and wet ponds.

Mr. Hoder stated they have been removed.

Mr. Pisauro stated the applicant did a series of soil testing in June and November of 2019. Has there been subsequent testing?

Mr. Hanrahan stated there has not been subsequent testing. D soils do not have to take into account the recharge. They are still able to use the bio basins with the underdrains. They have the tests from previously. They have enough testing throughout the site.

Mr. Hoder stated testing should be done.

Mr. Hanrahan stated this is a fill site so they will be at or above grade. The testing has been done and have DEP approval. With the updates they will need DEP approval and will meet the regulations they are referring to.

Mr. Pisauro stated the quality control are peak reductions. Are you changing the drainage patterns toward the wetland mitigation bank.

Mr. Hanrahan stated there is drainage that goes off to Hightstown – Cranbury Station Road. They are sending more water to the mitigation bank that does not go there today. It is minor and most does drain to mitigation bank. They will be sending a minor amount of water to the wetlands mitigation bank where it is preferred to go.

Mr. Hoder agrees that it will be a lot of the water that is going to exit far away from the bank away from Cranbury Station Road.

Kathy Morolda, 693 Yardley Way, Monroe, thanked the applicant for preserving the pond and vernal pool. The 15' truck bay ordinance should be honored. It may eliminate trucks.

Deanne Napurano, 92 Halsey Reed Road, Cranbury, has lived in Cranbury since 2004 and her home was built in the 1800s. She feels the disappearance of the vernal pool may have been an error and the shifting around of lot lines creates a slippery slope of development.

Janice Mondoker, 92 Halsey Reed Road, the proposed emergency exit should be moved, and deed restricted so it does not become an active route. Enforce the ordinances of 15' loading docks. She would like the sewer to be hooked up to the Halsey Reed Road homes.

Mr. Hoder stated you can provide force main connections, but it is difficult. It is a bad design. They will look at their sanitary sewer map to see if the area is in the sewer or septic zone.

Chair Kaiser stated it is septic and well.

Mr. Wittman stated they looked into providing homes near the farm to develop with the housing on it now on Dey Road and they would not allow anyone along Petty Road to tie into that.

Marianne Bossard, 91 Halsey Reed Road, Monroe, NJ, stated regarding the emergency exit, the building #2 emergency road still goes behind that building, looks as though it would be more efficient to go to Cranbury Hightstown Road. It is not clear who has access and who can open that gate, is it the emergency drivers. Can they get the fence installed on the front end of the project to discourage dump trucks to access the lot.

Mr. Hoder stated a condition could be no access from Halsey Reed Road and a temporary 6' high construction fence across the frontage.

Mr. Hanrahan stated there will be a 6' high chain link fence along that side of the property.

Nick Morolda, 693 Yardley Way, Monroe, NJ, stated an option could be to develop a smaller facility. The conservation easement should be abided by.

Mahir Majmundar, 11 Mission Dr, Monroe, stated there is no landscaping on the east side there and that is good if they repopulate the landscaping. The exit gate should be smaller so in the future no one can drive through and use. The enforcement should be to not use Halsey Reed Road as a parking lot.

Mona Mehta, 1 Mission Dr, Monroe, stated there should be safety measures to be taken for the residential housing due to kids playing and possibly going onto the site.

Deepak Katta, 39 Sheller Drive, Monroe, NJ, stated he agrees with the safety from the previous public comment. He would request 20' to 25' high wall for safety and the noise.

Akshay Patel, 3 Mission Dr., Monroe, stated his concern is the emergency exit. The trees will take 15 years to grow. There will be a noise problem and a safety issue.

Robert Barraro, 79 Halsey Reed Road, Monroe, NJ, asked what the truck noise will be, and the ordinances should be enforced.

Chair Kaiser stated this has been used for industrial for quite some time. The Board is doing the best we can to buffer.

Mr. Wittman stated Monroe built residential around our industrial. We can ask to put in more buffering or larger trees. Regarding the safety of the property, the site will be fenced off around the truck areas. Mr. Wittman would not recommend having the plan approved by HPC but would like the applicant to work with HPC.

Mr. Davidow stated under the MLUL the Planning Board does not have the authority to require the applicant to present to the HPC.

Mr. Davidow stated there was a comment on record that the Planning Board can enforce DEP rules and regulations. They can require the applicant to get outside agency approvals which will include DEP. The Board can request to have the DEP approval letter as a condition.

Mr. Vitiello stated the DEP is going to need submissions of the permit modification requests. They will see to it to make sure the wetlands mitigation bank will be a part of that submission. They would agree to put in more plantings which would be a variance. The applicant has revised the plan to comply with the ordinance and all the surrounding historic structures. There was a stormwater review as part of this application and there will be another review.

MOTIONED TO APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS: Mr. Wittman

SECONDED: Mr. Gallagher

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Ferrante, Mr. Gallagher, Ms. Spann, Mr. Wittman and Mr. Kaiser

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

MOTION PASSED

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

There being no further business, Mr. Wittman made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Spann offered a second. By unanimous vote, the meeting was thereupon adjourned at 12:00 am.

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY

I, the undersigned, do at this moment certify;

That I am duly elected and secretary of the Cranbury Township Planning Board and that the minutes of the Planning Board, held on August 4, 2022, consisting of (19) 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 Board this September 2, 2022.

Robin Tillou
Robin Tillou, Administrative Officer

/rst