

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

**MINUTES SEPTEMBER 7, 2017
APPROVED ON OCTOBER 5, 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 September 7, 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

Under the Sunshine Law, adequate notice by 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
- Glenn Gerken, Conflict Board Engineer
- Josette C. Kratz, Secretary
- Richard Preiss, Township Planner
- Virginia Guinta, Court Reporter

RESOLUTIONS

PB298-17 Plug Power/CBY
Block 10, Lot 10, Zone I-LI
Block 12, Lot 1, Zone I-LI,
22 Hightstown-Cranbury Station Road, Minor Site Plan

MOTION MADE BY: Mr. Kehrt
MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Schilling

ROLL CALL:

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

MOTION CARRIED

PB297-17 Garden State Building, L.P.
Block 13, Lot 13 & 16, Zone I-LI,
Halsey Reed Road, Minor Subdivision

MOTION MADE BY: Mr. Cook
MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Johnson

ROLL CALL:

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

MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATIONS

PB299-17 Cranbury Brick Yard (Subdivision)
 Block 10, Lot 10, Zone I-LI
 Block 12, Lot 1, Zone I-LI
 Brickyard Road
 Preliminary and Final Subdivision

REPRESENTATIVES: Christopher DeGrezia, Esquire
 Michael Golias, PE, Project Engineer, Lagan Engineer

EXHIBIT A-1 Existing Lot Configuration, Drawing No. 01.00, dated 9/7/2017
EXHIBIT A-2 Proposed Lot Configuration, Drawing No. 0.1.00, dated 9/7/2017
EXHIBIT A-3 Design Waiver Exhibit, Drawing CB-103, dated 9/7/2017

Mr. DeGrezia introduced himself and stated there were no changes to the site improvements or no changes to the structures. The subdivision on each of the lots allows them to secure financing on a building by building basis. This has been previously done for many of the sites here in Cranbury, as recently as the Home Depot campus. This complies with the ordinance. There are no new variances. There is a design waiver necessary, parking is required to be 25-FT away from a lot line and here there will be a layout that one side complies and the other side is 4.15-FT from the property. The site still functions the same.

Mr. Golias and the Board's professional were sworn.

Mr. Golias's credential has been previously accepted.

Mr. Stewart recused himself and stepped down from the dais.

Mr. Golias stated the overview of the application. They propose three lots, one for each of the three buildings. To divide the parcels, there is associates green space with each of the wetlands and deed-restricted areas associated with each building for each lot to comply with its FAR and impervious coverage. They propose one design waiver, located between Building Two and Building Three. Exhibit A-3 illustrates the design waiver; Section 150-43(a)3.

Mr. DeGrezia addressed access and shared facilities; typically, they put together a declaration of restrictions and easements which will be recorded after the subdivision is recorded. This would spell out the shared facilities.

Mr. DeGrezia explained the financing reasons why the subdivision helps along with maintenance obligations.

Mr. Gerken commented his concerns were the three items he pointed out in his September 1, 2017, review report; shared utilities, maintenance, and cross access easements.

Ms. Cecil stressed the need for one point of contact (single entity) in the event anything is not being maintained correctly for the Township to contact.

Mr. Robert Dillion, sworn, commented on previous and current conditions.

Mr. Cecil explained that this approval did not change any of the previous approvals and the conditions associated with those approvals.

MOTION MADE BY: Mr. Cook
MOTION SECONDED BY: Ms. Callahan

ROLL CALL:

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

MOTION CARRIED

PB288-16 ZHP/Plant Food
Block 16, Lot 12, Zone I-LI
38 Hightstown Cranbury Road
Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval

REPRESENTATIVES: Francis J. Brennan, III, Esquire – Brennan Law Firm
Theodore Platz, President - Plant Food
Loralie E. Totten, P.E. – Crest Engineering Associates Inc.

Board Professional Reports:

David Hoder, P.E. – Hoder Associates, August 28, 2017
Richard Preiss, P.P. & Katie Thielman-Puniello, AICP, P.P. – PPG LLC – August 30, 2017
Andrew Feranda – Shropshire – September 1, 2017

EXHIBIT A-1 Site Plan, Circulation Plan & Lighting Plan, 8/28/17, Colored by Crest Eng Assoc
EXHIBIT A-2 Three (3) photo mounted on board – Street Frontage
EXHIBIT A-3 Three (3) photo mounted on board – Interior of Site w/Ext of Building
EXHIBIT A-4 Three (3) photo mounted on board – View of Site
EXHIBIT A-5 Three (3) photo mounted on board – Showing Street Frontage
EXHIBIT A-6 Grading & Utility Plan, 8/28/17, Colored by Crest Eng Assoc
EXHIBIT A-7 Right of Way & Pavement Width Display, 9/6/17, Colored by Crest Eng Assoc
EXHIBIT A-8 Photograph taken at 8:20 p.m., 8/28/17

All professionals were sworn, both for the applicant and the Board.

Ms. Cecil announced jurisdiction.

Mr. Gallagher recused himself from this application.

Mr. Brennan introduced himself and Mr. Platz described the history of the property and how that got them to today where they needed the additional warehouse. They are in the business of blending and supplying liquid fertilizer. They once supply mainly the agriculture/farming industry and have branched out to supply also the golf course and lawn industry. There are no variances involved with this application, however, there are design waivers associated because of the uniqueness of the property; for the parking plan, the second waiver is for the style of the building, landscaping is another and the last is for soil testing and percolation testing.

Ms. Totten, credentials accepted by the Board, stated this is a proposal to erect an 80-ft x 150-ft long building identical to the existing building, the building would be connected to the existing building by a firewall with a door between the two buildings. She stated there would be four loading docks (revision to show five) and a small office for truck drivers to take care of paperwork. The access drive is a typical loading dock height and driveway slopes upward and then downward to meet existing roadway. The access is 80-ft wide at the building and widens out to a 100-ft diameter circle for a truck turn-around to back into the loading dock. Ms. Totten asked to work with Board's engineer to address a solution the curb returns at the ditch for the stormwater they proposed a pipe which they are requesting to move the radius back to come where the road was widened. There is an underground detention basin located between the end of the building and the property line with a concrete structure (modules) underground.

Ms. Totten explained the drainage system in detail. She added that there is no public sewer available so the failing septic system so there will be a new bed. There is a generator on site for the system and a portable pump, if necessary. She summarized the conclusion of the environmental impact statement, a short statement of negligible impact. The property is already well developed. The habitat study was already conducted because of the wood turtles in the area, however, the pond does not have running water (manmade pond). They are maintaining as much of the woods as possible. It was possible they would lose one of the large trees, because of the limited area to locate the driveway.

Ms. Totten explained that they were not proposing a berm along the street frontage. There are an existing buffer and ditch along with a nice lawn area in front and proposing some landscaping on either side of the driveway. They felt that disturbing the area to place a berm did not seem to have a significant benefit. The buildings are set back away from the roadway. They are requesting a waiver.

Mr. Brennan spoke with regard to the proposed right-of-way to the street frontage as proposed by the Board's professionals that there be a dedication. The applicant objects to that request. Ms. Totten explained their reasoning. Ms. Cecil stated her understanding was the professional was only asking for a dedication not a widening at this time, in the event, there is a need the road widened.

Mr. Feranda state he went along with the ordinance for the paved area, but the applicant could ask for relief as to why the 17-FT would be difficult. Mr. Hoder felt the applicant should give the dedication for future widening.

Mr. Brennen felt the widening was constrained because of the turnpike overpass anyway, so he asked what would be the purpose. Ms. Cecil felt it was important to state the objection for the dedication, not the actual widening.

Mr. Hoder stated he was the one pushing to have the roadway right-of-way dedication for many reasons. Application toward Hightstown has either widened or dedicated the right-of-ways. He stated this side would be the only reasonable possibility of road-widening. If Cranbury decided to widen it would have to be according to the plan and the 17-FT and at that time Cranbury would have to obtain that right-of-way. This is the time in which to ask for the dedication. Mr. Priess stated the dedication is not done for the property all of itself. The dedication is done because at some time the increase of the traffic will warrant the widening. There are still a lot of properties in East Windsor and Cranbury which can be developed and this could be an alternative route to Exit 8. He stated Cranbury should avoid widening, if at all possible, for the reasons stated. However, in the future, if it needed to happen this would avoid the process of condemnation. He recommended the Board insist on the dedication but not insist on the widening at this time.

Mr. Hasselbach felt the widening shouldn't burden the applicant. Mr. Hoder said there are times when other Townships would provide mitigating landscaping.

Mr. Priess explained the applicant was requesting a substantial number of waivers from design, landscaping, etc., which most applications would not be allowed to do. This is an older, historic industrial area where the aesthetics and level of improvements are different. He stated in context it was a different area and waiving of these things was appropriate, but he stated the roadway dedication was a reasonable request.

Ms. Totten asked for a partial waiver on the pipe size.

Mr. Hasselbach mentioned a fix for the driveway turn around and turning up the asphalt.

Mr. Hoder mentioned a water quality system. Ms. Totten said they were waiting until the stormwater system was installed.

Mr. Hoder mentioned the LOI. Ms. Totten said they had not yet submitted for the driveway crossing and mentioned this is an ordinary wetland, as opposed to a buffer.

Mr. Ferenda asked about fire truck turning radius. Ms. Totten stated she would consult with the fire company on their truck sizes. Mr. Ferenda asked about the handicapped spaces and Ms. Totten said they would provide.

Mr. Hasselbach suggested a standpipe in the pond. Mr. Brennan said as long as that is a suggestion and not a condition they would look into it.

There were no public comments made when the floor was opened to the public.

Mr. Stewart motioned for the approval of the application as discussed. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion.

MOTION MADE BY: Mr. Stewart
MOTION SECONDED BY: Ms. Callahan

ROLL CALL:

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

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 September 7, 2017, consisting of _____ (__) 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 _____, 2017.

Josette C. Kratz, Secretary

/jck