

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
TOWNSHIP OF CRANBURY  
23-A NORTH MAIN STREET  
CRANBURY, NEW JERSEY 08512**

(609) 395-0900, Ext. 221  
FAX (609) 395-3560

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Summary of Meeting**

Meeting Date: April 6, 2023

Meeting Commenced 5:00 p.m.

The Development Review Committee conducted the following informal meetings as required pursuant to Township Land Development Section 150-76. This meeting was held in Town Hall, 23A N. Main Street, Cranbury, NJ 08512.

**DRC MEMBERS:**

- ☐ Eman El-Badawi (TC & PB Member)
- ☐ James Gallagher (Alternate PB Member)
- ☐ Michael Kaiser (PB Member)
- ☒ Richard Kallan (ZBA Member)
- ☒ Evelyn Spann (PB Member)
- ☒ Merilee Meacock (ZBA Member)
- ☐ Jason Mildenberg (EC Representative)
- ☒ Wayne Wittman (PB Member)
- ☐ Joseph Buonavolonta (ZBA Alternate Member)

**PROFESSIONALS/ CONSULTANT/STAFF ATTENDANCE:**

- ☒ Andrew Feranda, Board Traffic Consultant – Shropshire Associates, LLC.
- ☒ Sharon Dragan, Esquire – Mason, Griffin & Pierson, P.C.
- ☒ David Hoder, P.E., Board Engineer – Maser Consulting
- ☒ Elizabeth Leheny, PP, Board Planner
- ☒ Robin Tillou, Planning/Zoning Administrative Officer

## DISCUSSIONS:

DRC373-23 Main Park, LLC  
Concept Plans  
Block 23, Lot(s) 47 & 48 – Zone VC (Village Commercial)  
61 & 63 N. Main Street  
Retail and Residential Use

Applicant's Representatives Attending: Steven Golisano AIA, Steven J. Golisano  
Architect  
Juliana Lako, Owner  
William Lako, Owner

A brief description of proposed development as explained by the architect and owner:

The proposal is to rebuild the existing building located at 63 N. Main Street that was previously the Cranbury Pizza building that had a fire several years ago and has been vacant from the previous owners. The concept is to make it a three-floor building with the first floor to be commercial, the second floor commercial/residential and the third floor residential. The current owners purchased the property in this state. The plan is to improve the downtown streetscape. The property is located at N. Main Street and W. Park Place. W. Park Place is an easement put into place in the 1950s for access to the rear of the post office. W. Park Place is to the south of both properties and technically is not a road. Block 43, Lot(s) 49 & 142.01 are part of the easement (W. Park Place). 61 N. Main Street is the Victorian corner property which is a commercial property on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor and residential on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. There was an American Coffee and Spice Mill previously on the area that cut through the property (pictures in the documents submitted by the architect). The concept is to not make an exact replica of the Coffee and Space Mill but pay respect to it by matching and finding an appropriate massing. The area disturbance is to increase the general size of the building to the west. The setbacks will be maintained. The more impact area will be replaced with a permeable paving surface with an underground water retention area to take care of stormwater needs. The concept is to create an appropriate massing to be seen throughout town and a scale of Main Street buildings to not maximize the height but still looking to get three (3) stories. The sidewalks in front of the two properties would be extended straight through for the brick sidewalk and plant a tree where the tree was previously. 61 N. Main Street would remain the same. The outdoor dining area would be behind 61 N. Main Street and in front of the new building dedicated to the new tenant of the space. That could change. The outdoor space can be a gathering space for the public. The brick on the building is supposed to mimic the brick on the sidewalk. They will be increasing the size of the trash and recycling shed at the side of the handicap space. There is an existing one and they would like to expand that to the north. That allows for a service entrance along the back of the building so there can be deliveries to the new space. Everything to the left of the shed will remain for the existing gravel driveway, parking area, and handicap parking. There is an existing street parking off West Park Place. The apron will not be changed for the existing parking area. The underground utilities for the northeast of the plan in the top right corner presents a series of power and surface lines that run into the building now and it is the hope that everything will go down the telephone poles and into the building underground. They are trying to screen and work to have meters in place of the basement of this building, so they are not visible on the outside.

The AC and other condensing units will be shielded from West Park Place and Main Street. There is a power pit that forms another outdoor mechanical area. The concept is to remove the one rear porch entry. The historic district design guidelines will be followed.

**Issues stated by the developer/developer's representatives:**

Signage and the strong horizontal form of the building.

Whether sidewalk would be applicant's responsibility or the Township's responsibility.

Guidance on lot consolidation.

**Issues stated by the professionals:**

Andrew Feranda wanted confirmation that all the bodies have been removed from the cemetery that was previously at that property. (Mr. Golisano advised Mr. Feranda that the building was a church in the 1740's and all the bodies have been removed and relocated that were there. Can investigate where it was relocated to further.)

Put the required number of parking spaces for what is being proposed for the residential/commercial space. Make sure the proposed calculations and the required spaces are on the plan. Outdoor event space will create more of a need for parking. Show public parking could accommodate those events. The library's approval may have used some of the parking spaces on the road in their calculations, that should be looked into to make sure the library did not claim those spots.

Trash operation should be discussed. Parking may be able to be there if the trash removal happens by rolling out the dumpster.

The noise from possible events should be investigated.

Elizabeth Leheny – Consolidating the lots should be investigated as an option. The advantage is there are accessory uses on the corner lot that are serving a principle use on an adjacent lot and a variance would be needed for that if they stay as separate lots. An accessory use must be on the same lot.

You cannot have more than 5,000 sq. ft. of floor area.

For the space to the rear, the first two floors are commercial, what would go on the second floor for a commercial space?

No elevators were indicated.

Sharon Dragan – Could go before Zoning Board due to d(4) – FAR (increase the floor area ratio) or d(5) density. Any use variance would bring this potential application to the Zoning Board. Outdoor Dining is on two separate lots and if you do not consolidate then a variance would be needed for that.

David Hoder – Determine the exact calculation of the height because if it is 38, 35 is required. Surface coverage is 60% maximum.

The spaces in front of the dumpster are discouraged.

The stormwater management is something that must be done for the flow that comes off the site. Imperviable pavers is a positive which should be run into an underground basin of some kind which will be metered out to the soil or a storm system.

The sidewalks improvement are a positive and the applicant will more than likely be responsible

for the sidewalk.

**DRC Member Concerns:**

Mr. Wittman - The existing building was deemed inhabitable and needed to be torn down.  
A sidewalk should be extended to the library so different sidewalks are not going into the library.

Ms. Spann – The Township recently repaired the sidewalks in the front of the lots. It may not be maintenance compatible and should be coordinated with the Township if that should be done.

Choose a good walking surface.

Since COVID, there is outdoor dining to the curb. All the restaurants on Main Street are allowed to have tables out to the curb. If those restaurants are doing that, then this development should not be prohibited from outdoor dining.

Sort out what belongs to CHA and what belongs to the Township.

Ms. Meacock – The post office view of the back building should be looked at. It seems taller than the front building. It hurts the composition.

The precedent of the old Spice Mill is horizontal, and the back is vertical, especially on the post office side.

The roof plan on the back building with the different kind of gables is odd.

The trash enclosure feels like an occupiable pavilion, and it should be toned down.

Make sure to show fire escapes and exhausts for the retail/restaurant.

Three (3) flats would be beneficial for the residential. It may be difficult to rent out a larger residential.

Mr. Kallan – The approximate heights of the existing buildings are 30 ft., 26 ft., and 22 ft. (post office). The proportions will not look right.

The ADA ramp services the front building and then there are steps. The rear requires no ramps, etc.

Depending on the number of bedrooms in the residential area, that could affect the parking calculations.

What guarantee would be put in place that storage would be placed in the basement. There is a 9' ceiling in the basement so a tenant could decide it would be good for commercial or a dwelling.