

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

**MINUTES APRIL 20, 2017
APPROVED ON May 18, 2017**

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

The regular meeting of the Cranbury Township Planning Board was held at the Cranbury Township Hall Municipal Building, 23-A North Main Street, Cranbury, New Jersey, Middlesex County on April 20, 2017, at 7:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Art Hasselbach, Chairman of the Cranbury Township Planning Board, called the meeting to order.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

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

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

- Callahan, Karen
- Cook, David
- Gallagher, James
- Hasselbach, Arthur
- Johnson, Glenn
- Kehrt, Allan
- Mavoides, Peter
- Schilling, Brian
- Stewart, Jason

PROFESSIONALS IN ATTENDANCE

- Andrew Feranda, Traffic Consultant
- David Hoder, Board Engineer
- Trishka Cecil, Esquire, Board Attorney
- Jean Golisano, Deputy Clerk – filling in for Ms. Kratz who was on vacation
- Richard Preiss, Township Planner

BOARD PROFESSIONALS REPORTS:

David Hoder, PE, Hoder Associates, April 1, 2017
Cranbury Volunteer Fire Company, April 11, 2017
Andrew Feranda, PE, PTOE, CME, Shropshire Associates LLC, April 13, 2017
Richard Preiss, PP, Phillips Preiss Grygiel, April 14, 2017

EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT A-1 Colorized Sheet 3 of 9, dated March 28, 2017, East Point Engineering
EXHIBIT A-2 Arial photograph
EXHIBIT A-3 Photograph of site before demolition
EXHIBIT A-4 Photograph
EXHIBIT A-5 Letter of intent landscape architect
EXHIBIT A-6 Color Concept Elevations, Minno Wasko Architects, and Planner
EXHIBIT A-7 Site section, second page of the handout, Minno Wasko Architects, and Planner
EXHIBIT A-8 Entry Sign

Ms. Cecil announced the notice was in order and the Board could take jurisdiction.

Mr. Himelman gave an overview of the proposed application.

Ms. Cecil swore in the applicant's professionals and the Board's professionals.

Mr. Loureiro stated this would be his primary office location. All-Tech is a large framing company consisting of 26 employees; 24 of which are field personnel. Hours of operation range from 7 am to 5 pm, Monday through Friday. Most of their deliveries are made using small box trucks, one to two deliveries per week. Occasionally, there is a tractor trailer delivery for specialty materials, but most are made using small box trucks. The only time they would have all field personnel in the office was during their quarterly meetings, held after hours. Office staff would be gone and the field staff comes in for that quarterly meeting. They did not anticipate a time when all staff and field personnel would be in the office at the same time. He stated the garbage disposal system would contain the typical office type trash. There would be no construction debris on site. There was a question about a room marked for kids, and Mr. Loureiro stated it was for the employees who may have a sick child who cannot go to school, it provides an area for them.

Mr. Gallagher asked about any pre-fabrication activity that would occur on the property.

Mr. Loureiro said there would be none. Everything was done on the construction site in "the field" and materials were already pre-manufactured.

Mr. Gallagher asked how the occasional tractor trailer would get onto the site.

Mr. Loureiro stated they performed a turning analysis and testified trucks could maneuver on site. Presently their facility is located on Cranbury South River Road, and this would be replacing that location. Vehicles used by their project managers are taken to employees' homes at night, they are not left at this site overnight. There would be no draining of contaminants. Vehicle work would be limited to small maintenance. The applicant was not able to work out anything with the storm drainage and the adjacent property owner, Home Depot.

Mr. Hoder had no issues with the storm water system. Mr. Hoder suggested wording as a condition that no floor drains without wording installation of appropriate cleansing devices. Mr. Gallagher suggested in the resolution indicating a necessary review by the Board Engineer to assure any areas of concern with regard of contaminating discharges.

Mr. Leber was qualified and accepted. Mr. Leber stated he prepared the site plan and gave an overview of the site. This is an undersized lot. The previous use of this property was a residential use and had two actual freestanding garage structures. Station Road is under the jurisdiction of Middlesex County. The adjacent property is surrounded by landscaped berms, 18 FT high and higher. These berms border two sides of the applicant's property. The applicant testified that this project would include a new construction, three-story building at approximately 19,000 SF. Access to the property would be at two locations: Station Road and Police Drive. There is a designated loading zone in the rear of the building, 30 FT x 35 FT. There is a four-car garage with doors, facing Police Drive. The garbage facility is located between the loading zone and the access to the garage there is a grass island with a walled concrete pad, situated at an angle to facilitate a garbage truck entering the site at Police Drive. There is two drainage system, runoff goes half to the rear and half out the front of the property. He explained the drainage flow in more detail. Underneath the parking lot was a storm trench system to handle the runoff to the rear, allowing it to percolate through a sand filter at the edge of the pavement.

Mr. Leber testified the site would be serviced via public water and public sewer. They provided a lighting design and landscape plan, which appears to be deficient based on the comments received from the professionals. They retained a separate firm, Land Identity (Greg Spadaro, Certified Landscaped Architect in NJ) who is working on a plan to address the comments made on April 11, 2017 reports.

Mr. Hoder stated the source of the comment was partially his letter, he felt the changes would not be large and necessary for testimony this evening.

EXHIBIT A-5 Letter from Landscape Architect at Land Identity, dated April 11, 2017

Mr. Leber stated the first variance requested was a front yard setback of 125 FT (corner lot requires two setback variances of 125 FT each). The largest hardship for the whole property is that the property is only 175 FT wide. To comply, there would be no area in which to develop. They developed a 50 FT street "setback" line on plans between the building and Police Drive. The four-car garage is 30.39 FT from the right-of-way. The entire building is a variance, technically. They would provide connectivity to the existing sidewalk.

Mr. Hasselbach commented the sidewalk was not used very much now.

Mr. Leber stated they proposed a 60 SF ground sign.

Mr. Hoder wanted the applicant to deter people walking on the grass creating little trails. The parking stalls were standard size, which required the applicant to request a waiver because of the design limitation and provide the amount of parking required. He didn't feel it was a detriment to the neighbor since it was adjacent to the portion of their property which could never be developed.

Mr. Hasselbach if asked would it be an issue. Mr. Preiss, given the height of the berm located there, would not be an issue. Mr. Preiss answered felt the all the variances relate to the fact this is a leftover parcel, the property could never be developed according to the zone and this is an undersized lot and given the adjacent are he didn't feel it would create an impact. To utilize this property, given its narrow width, he felt a variance would be justified. Mr. Leber stated they would provide site triangles. The light pole footing would be 30". They would defer to the Board Planner on the style of the lighting, since the additional maximum lighting was slightly over. Applicant asked for a waiver of the environmental report because this is an infield development surrounded by existing infrastructure and not in an area adjacent to wetlands.

Mr. Hoder felt a partial waiver would be acceptable. He felt a one-page letter would be sufficient to address noise, glare, emissions, etc., in addition to Mr. Gallagher's concern with the floor drains. Applicant agreed.

Mr. Preiss addressed that berms were required in the area to screen the loading dock areas and trailer storage areas. This is an attractive building and the parking is wrapped around toward the back of the building and felt there was no reason to berm. Additional landscaping should complement the building, not hide it, and could be reviewed by the professionals.

The applicant would comply with Mr. Fernanda's review memo. The exception was #8, the mapping should both Police Drive and Logan Drive and asked the actual name. Mr. Feranda stated Logan Drive. The applicant would update their plans to reflect the correct name. The applicant would comply with the fire company review memo.

Ms. Rummler, having qualified, testified on the architectural design of the building. Ms. Rummler explained the details of the architectural design and elevations.

Mr. Gallagher suggested considering the code requirements for the overhead doors, access doors, and emergency exits. Mr. Rummler stated they would follow all the applicable codes.

Mr. Stewart complimented the front and the right elevation. He stated the road is at a slight angle where there will be no berming on the corner of Cranbury Station Road where most people would be experiencing the building at the angle toward the front. They would see that corner before they would see the "true" front. He felt the landscaping and a tall tree could address it, however, it was a basically a sparse part of the building, with a whole lot of stucco on the side before they elaborate part. He asked why there were no windows or other architectural features on that side. Ms. Rummler stated the corner office already had two windows. They had not officially communicated with the landscape architect but she felt they would work to address this type of façade to enhance the elevation. Equipment would be shielded per EXHIBIT A-7. They would have a small direction sign directing people to the front entrance.

Mr. Hasselbach asked if the travel agency was still part of the business to be located in this building. Mr. Loureiro stated it would and would be housed within one of these offices. He explained Nomad Expeditions briefly to the Board, stating there are four employees who work as travel agents in addition to booking trips to Mongolia. Most travel is booked through the telephone for businesses like National Geographic, Audubon Society, and other large clients.

Mr. Preiss stated that this architect is known as a corporate sustainable design architectural firm.

Mr. Hasselbach opened the floor to the public; having none he closed the floor.

Mr. Stewart moved to approve with all the specified waivers and variances and with all the exceptions noted by the professionals that were outlined in the presentation as well as the additional discussion in the beginning about the automotive concerns.

Ms. Cecil outlined a few of the conditions mentioned; no floor drains or if there are they must install appropriate cleansing devices, match closures to the main buildings, pathway, revised landscaping plan to be submitted to the board professionals for review.

Mr. Stewart added the waiver change of the environmental report; agreed was a partial waiver with a letter as stated. The applicant would not wash vehicles.

Mr. Hasselbach asked that there be mention of the travel business in addition to the main tenant, All-Tech, so there is no question in the future.

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Ms. Callahan, Mr. Cook, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Mavoides, Mr. Schilling,
Mr. Stewart, Mr. Hasselbach.
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Mr. Kehrt

MOTION CARRIED

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, do hereby certify;

That I am duly elected and acting secretary of the Cranbury Township Planning Board and, that the foregoing minutes of the Planning Board, held on April 20, 2017, consisting of seven (7) pages, constitute a true and correct copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name of said Planning Board this May 18, 2017.

Josette C. Kratz, Secretary

/jck