

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

**MINUTES MARCH 5, 2020
APPROVED ON MAY 7, 2020**

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 March 5, 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

Absent	Callahan, Karen (Excused)
Present	Gallagher, James
Present	Hamlin, Judson
Present	Kaiser, Michael
Present	Scott, Matt
Present	Spann, Lynn
Absent	Stewart, Jason (Excused)
Present	Whitman, 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

MINUTES

Minutes for January 9, 2020 – Upon a motion made and seconded were unanimously approved.

RESOLUTIONS

PB302-17 Alfieri Cranbury South Brunswick Park, Cranbury
Block 1, Lots 2, 3, 8 & 10, RO/LI, Zone,
South Brunswick – Block 7, Lot 6.01,
1241, 1243 & 1245 South River Road, Property is surround by Route 130 &
South River Road
Amendment to original approval seeking a design waiver regarding tree
caliper/size

MOTION FOR APPROVAL:	Hamlin
SECOND TO MOTION:	Wittman

ROLL CALL:

AYES:	Gallagher, Hamlin, Scott, Spann, Wittman
NAYS:	None
ABSTAIN:	Kaiser
ABSENT:	Calhan, Stewart

Motion Passed

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
Hannah Mazzaccaro, AICP - ESE Land Planning Eng
Jay Holtz, Toll Brothers, Vice President of Land Development
Carl Penke, Traffic Eng, Langan Eng

EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT A-1 Existing Conditions Map, prepared by ESE
EXHIBIT A-2 Preliminary/Final Major Site Plan, prepared by ESE
EXHIBIT A-3 Township Riparian Zone Exhibit, prepared by ESE
EXHIBIT A-4 Site Plan Alternative, prepared by ESE
EXHIBIT A-5 Township Riparian Zone Exhibit (Alternative Plan)

Ms. Cecil announced the applicant has re-noticed making sure to include the riparian variance, and she was satisfied with the notice and the Board could take jurisdiction.

Mr. Hoff introduced himself and explained the application was for preliminary and final major subdivision and site plan, proposing 174 single family active senior units. As a result, from the settle agreement approved by the Superior Court, the zone was changed to PAR. This evening the intent was to present the testimony related to the riparian variance. The variance only dictates the final outcome of the layout of the project to avoid the riparian buffer issue.

Mr. Mavoides stated the Board would focus first on the variance issue tonight.

Ms. Cecil sworn in the applicant's and board's professionals.

Mr. Kruse gave his credentials and was accepted by the board. Mr. Kruse explained the property was called the 'Protinick Farm' and use for architectural purposes. There presently is a farm stand, building and house. The property is located north on Dey Road (County roadway) and west on Petty Road (Township roadway), on the eastern boarder there is a small irrigation pond and southward there is a wetland area that extends off the property to the adjacent lot. He explained the wetlands and other environmental constraints, using Exhibit A-1 for display purposes.

Mr. Kruse noted the 150-ft riparian area on the eastern area, a small irrigation pond, shown per the NJDEP requirements. It was an irrigation pond created as part of the farm/agricultural use. This pond is replenished by two wells on the site in order to keep the pond at an adequate water level. Cranbury Township's ordinances state that all water bodies, whether man made or natural, must be shown. Shown also is the Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission steam corridor, which extends 100-ft from the actual flood area.

The irrigation pond (shown on plan) also is a riparian zone per the NJDEP requirements which was shown, however, the applicant does not anticipate there will be a riparian zone for this because it is a man-made feature. The letter of interpretation from the NJDEP delineates the wetlands area. The light tan area is the actively disturbed/farmed area.

Using Exhibit A-2, Mr. Kruse showed the proposed plan and the irrigation pond's environmental delineation locations. Exhibit A-3 showed the area in question and where the applicant was proposing development, within the 150-ft Township riparian zone. This would (the area within the 150-ft riparian zone) affect roughly eight developable lots, in an area that is presently being disturbed by farming activity. Lot 27 and Lot 28, as shown on the site plan. Along the border of the tree line is an existing farm access.

The proposed developer stated they do not have intentions to disturb any wooded area that surrounds the irrigation pond. The irrigation pond is not directly connected with any of the streams, it is isolated and fed by a small area of low land flow. That low land flow would be reduced by the development. The real flow, the wells, would be abandoned therefore the pond would dry up. It is a solely isolated water body located in an area that the DEP classified as intermediate value wetlands. Mr. Kruse felt most of the Township's riparian ordinance did not apply to this man-made irrigation pond and he explained how it did not accomplish the terms of the Township's ordinance. Presently there is no controlled runoff, however when the homes are built any runoff from those properties would go into the the development's own stormwater collection system, where it would be required to meet the DEP requirements for stormwater control in accordance with best management practices. This is not a large body that supports a magnitude of aquatic life or water dependent habitat. There is no threatened or endangered species within that location. Increases 50 to 150 ft does not serve the purpose of providing more shade, shelter, etc., because it is an actively farmed area there is no shade or shelter presently. The ordinance is more for linear features that have a long, connected. This body is isolate and does not connect for the travel of species. There are no aesthetics that will increase property values, along with no educational or recreation values.

Mr. Preiss asked, in terms of the classification what is considered a wetland in a riparian zone, does the DEP make a distinction between those that are man made. Mr. Kruse said the DEP does make a distinction of a man-made area, and this has less than a 50-ft drainage area and is not connect with any other surface feature. We do not think it would be categorized. Mr. Kruse added that they have noted there is a 50-ft buffer to assure if the DEP does classify that somehow

and to make sure that we were staying away from that if the DEP did classify that as a feature that had a riparian zone. Mr. Preiss asked if at this point the applicant had that DEP classification verified that the riparian zone actually exists. Mr. Preiss asked in essentially, they were requesting, on the cautionary side once the application is approved and the DEP did classify it in that manner, is that correct? If we took the situation that the riparian zone was not classified by the DEP would that also mean that the Cranbury riparian zone would also not apply?

Mr. Kruse said, from review of the terminology in the ordinance he believes it would still require a 150-ft buffer because the definition applies to all water bodies, mandated or not.

Mr. Preiss asked if the applicant felt that the change from 50-ft to 150-ft buffer did not change anything from an environmental benefit in terms of protect for that wooded area.

Mr. Kruse stated that other than a distance from development he saw no benefit.

Mr. Preiss asked if the applicant would comply to a condition it would remain in its current form? Mr. Kruse said yes.

Using Exhibit, A-4, Mr. Kruse explained to the board the alternative plan which depicted 172 units with the units within that zone removed and relocated at other areas within the unit. The difference is the layout of the road system to Road E and Road F, which was Exhibit A-2 would not longer have the cul-de-sac roads, they will become 'through' roads to Road A and Road C.

Mr. Preiss indicated the lot sizes seem to have changed to more generous lot sizes and houses more distance. Mr. Kruse agreed Exhibit A-2 gave more room and better road layout and Exhibit A-4 reduces privacy and layout.

Mr. Hoder asked, on proposed plan, the applicant had about 450-ft storm drain pipe running to the back of those lots. It would be a good idea, as indicated in his letter, to relocate that and would the applicant do that. It was suggested to run 90 degree pipes out to the rear, if needed, to avoid disturbance so close to the trees or under canopy of the trees. If the wells are removed and less ground surface runs to the irrigation pond would that pond tend to nitrify, one of the items in the Cranbury ordinance.

Mr. Kruse said yes, because a majority of it is being feed by a well.

Mr. Hoder indicated there was a 'rip rap' apron, down below by Cedar Brook in the Cranbury 150-ft riparian buffer zone.

Mr. Kruse said yes, the stormwater is discharged to a depression that discharges to Cedar Brook which they did not realize, and they could modify.

Mr. Kruse, answering a question from Mr. Preiss, said the wells would not be used by future residences nor would they remain functional.

Ms. Mazzaccaro, credentials were accepted, went through the C2 Variance criteria, positive and negative. The layout with the cul-de-sacs allows for more open space and enjoyable layout to encourage recreation. The original plan still incorporated the wooded area and from a visual perspective there is nothing to be gained by going with the alternative plan. She felt it would become overgrown with evasive species which is unfortunately what ends up happening in these areas. There will still be a 150-ft buffer on the southern end along the Cedar Brook, which will not be disturbed and maintained. All the purposes of the riparian ordinance are being meant in terms of the linear waterways adjacent to the site. There are no hydrologies that tie this irrigation pond to the Cedar Brook in a linear fashion. The ordinance applies to the pond because it is an open water feature, however, it is not a pond being feed. The area the development will disturb is currently being disturbed. The riparian ordinance does have an exception for areas that have been previously disturbed by impervious surfaces, which she felt was a similar situation.

Ms. Mazzaccaro explained, although not a purpose in the MLUL, that if a development provides affordable housing, it is a purpose and objectives of the Master Plan to provide affordable housing. The PAR zoning in place for this development is part of a settlement agreement to provide a 25% 'set-aside' in the form of an affordable housing trust fund donation to the Township. If fewer homes are built than the 25% amount would ultimately reduce the per unit basis of funding that the Township would receive.

Ms. Mazzaccaro felt that the variance was justified.

Mr. Gallagher asked if there were any quantifications of how much water was added to this irrigation pond and taken out. The engineer implied the pond was shrinking and it was not much of pond, and it has been stated that water has been added to the pond but also it is an irrigation pond which water is being taken out of. He asked for a balance on the in and out amounts.

Mr. Kruse said they did not. That information is the discretion of the farmer and he was not sure that they had an irrigation plan which has those quantities.

Mr. Gallagher stated that we don't really now the viability of this pond and will it continue as a pond. He asked about the area within the 150-ft buffer and it is not an opportunity to turn in into a natural area to expand the wooded area, rather than a grass area.

Mr. Kruse stated the ordinance indicates one cannot do anything within the buffer area.

Mr. Kaiser asked the board could approve a variance in which to do something, to enhance it.

Mr. Wittman asked when the pond was erected. He asked what the current level of water in the pond was right now. Mr. Kruse said the farm operator indicated it was anywhere between ten to twelve feet at its deepest point. Mr. Wittman asked that last time the irrigation pond was used. Mr. Kruse did not have an answer. Mr. Wittman indicated that, over the winter, it has not been used at all, so the pond may be filled to the top from natural ground water and with no need to be filled, periodically from the wells. It could stay filled all year, as Mr. Gallagher mentioned, these irrigation ponds are placed in depressed areas where it was naturally wet, and the soils would hold water and recharge.

Mr. Wittman asked if emergency services, would it be easier to respond on roads that go through or those with cul-de-sacs. Mr. Kruse stated it would be advantageous for the through roads. Mr. Wittman said that there may be a plus side for services that need to be conducted in these areas that having through roads would be better than cul-de-sacs. Mr. Wittman also mentioned that this could be used as an asset to the community with trails instead of overgrowth.

Mr. Kruse stated the irrigation pond is isolated and has no connectivity to any other natural areas; roads, sidewalks, etc., in order to get to that since it is surrounded by development.

Ms. Cecil mentioned that she was not sure, by what the ordinance states as disturbance, that one could put pathways. Ms. Cecil read the portion of the definition out loud.

Mr. Kaiser mentioned the topo lines indicate changes to the grade. Looking at the overlay on top of the satellite image there shows a tree line, and so does that mean those trees would be removed.

Mr. Kruse stated, on Exhibit A-3, that where we see trees it is the tree canopy, not the actual base of the trees.

Mr. Kaiser asked if they would be disturbing the soil at the base of those trees. In those four lots would there be fill in the riparian zone, underneath the trees.

Mr. Kruse stated there would be a slight area of fill. If it becomes an issue the board is concerned about, they could adjust the grade underneath the tree canopy.

Mr. Kaiser noted that all the trees and sidewalks were absent, assuming that was not the applicant's intention?

Mr. Kruse noted that it was omitted in order to get this to the board as exponentially as possible. If the board was to proceed with this plan, they would add those infrastructure amenities to the plans.

Mr. Kaiser said there was a significant amount of 'cut and fill' happening to make this all work, is there any difference between the 174 units and the 172 units, will that affect the 'cut and fill' of the property.

Mr. Kruse stated they had not revised the grading between the two plans, but they do have the capability to assure the 'cut and fill' balance is maintained.

Mr. Scott noticed that there is a lot of asphalt which will create a potential for a lot of run off, have you calculated runoff with the new plan. Mr. Kruse answered that will the extensions of road from Road F and Road E from the cul-de-sac there would be an increase of roughly a half acre. This is an increase in that type of impervious. That would be accommodated by our stormwater features and can handle, but it would be an increase of impervious to the overall site plan.

Mr. Scott asked how much small the individual lots would be. Mr. Kruse answered the average lot size would be 8,025 SF for the smallest lot size. The impact are the homes on the cul-de-sac lots themselves. Mr. Scott stated he would echo Mr. Gallagher's comments as the alternate site plans is trying to cramp in as many houses as possible and it is not attractive. It seems that it would make more sense to lose a few more houses, would it not make it a more aesthetically pleasing development.

Mr. Kruse said they are not worried about aesthetics. The original concept was what was anticipate and concerned about leaving the area green, and we are asking now to keep a piece of farm field in its farm field state which does not service any aesthetic purpose. The relief we are seeking we feel adds to the aesthetics, not detract from it.

Mr. Scott asked if there were not any other alternative plan provided.

Mr. Hoff stated this was the only plan.

Ms. Scott stated the Petty Road neighbors fought with and have dealt with is drainage and she suspected there would be a lot of conversation related to drainage, stormwater, etc. She noted it is really important to those residents on Petty Road and Ms. Spann said she appreciated what the developer was doing to help with the road and all the efforts made at this point. She mentioned, at the DRC last year, there was conversation about the riparian zone; if you knew then about the riparian zone would your engineer designed this area differently.

Mr. Hoff stated he was sure, because they wouldn't have been able to do the original plan and may have avoided it. He added that when they knew about the riparian zone, the first thing they did was carved out the area and there now was an odd shape area to work around. They are working to achieve a yield and the goal was created based on this plan. They could not pick up the lost yield.

Ms. Spann asked if you knew about the riparian zone, which you should have known about, during the DRC because it was brought to your attention by the environmental representative and chairman, if you knew about it would the design look differently? She really liked the original design and have taken feedback from the Township and felt it was a good project and product for new residence in Cranbury. If you put the riparian zone in there and decrease the amount you can fit because of the less acreage and she wanted to be careful on unintended consequences. Your new design is different for reasons and suggested they go back and dissect and try again. The first design has more grass areas and permeable areas for natural runoff. She noted her concern for how much water hits that road. That bridge on Petty Road floods regularly. She asked if the pond overflow goes to the stream to the bridge.

Mr. Kruse stated it would fill up and flow over the crest into the wetland area, the large expansive area that runs along the border and would sit. If there was enough water, it would make its way down through the wooded area and eventually to the bridge.

Ms. Spann asked if the applicant is disconnecting the wells and that water area stabilized or decreases that would only help our flooding situation and not exasperate it.

Mr. Kruse said it should help keep water from going to Cedar Brook.

Ms. Spann asked if there were soil logs for that area.

Mr. Kruse said it was a wetland area, so they were not allowed to collect soil testing.

Ms. Spann asked for the site.

Mr. Kruse noted they did. The permeability for the site is conducive for recharge and incorporated that to the DEP standards for the site and provided the ponds.

Ms. Spann asked, if conducive, then would it not be better to have more grass. She understood their approach to the variance, and indicating it is farmland and already disturbed; 'two wrongs don't make one right'.

Mr. Kruse stated they are not putting it back to a true riparian area they would be leaving it as a farm field. He said that they could not right the wrong. By denying the variance does 'right the wrong', it will still remain a strip of farmland and will not be contributing to any of the purposes of the ordinance. The applicant is not asking you to choose from natural state and development, it is already at the developed state, the farmer did that.

Ms. Spann said that a farm field and a backyard with grass and fertilizer to keep that grass beautiful is very different.

Mr. Kruse agreed it was certainly different and their position from the perspective of riparian protection it is the same; there is no riparian protection there. He added that none of the review letter flagged this riparian area.

Mr. Kaiser stated the applicant did a good job explaining in infinite detail as to what this is, but the applicant lacks images of the area which would have helped make a decision. He stated images would help in the decision to alter a riparian zone and we need to see what it looks like. Mr. Scott added mages would help the Board make a decision.

Mr. Mavoides opened the floor to the public.

Mr. Barton Jackson, 18 Petty Road, sworn, he indicated his wife drinks water from their well which is across from the property where this construction company develop. He felt the developer was doing a fine job at distraction. He asked if there has been a good environmental assessment. He felt there was more to this and which they had been more diligent in their environmental search. They are creating a vast drain system and would not be pure rainwater that reaches the Cedar Brook and the area they dismissing as wetlands. This runoff will reach the water that my family drinks from and would like not to do away with the well to increase the profit of the firm. He asked if there would be oversight to the flow of water and quality and beneficial care taking of these properties to assure our water remains to quality it is now.

Mr. Hoff stated the board was only to concentrate of the issue before the board and whether they would be permitted to develop in this area or not.

Mr. Movoides explained that this was purely on the variance.

Mr. Preiss stated the applicant would have to show and prove that the quality of the water.

Mr. Paul Mullen, 102 Main Street, sworn, agreed there was a lot of distraction and agreed with that statement. He stated that was a surface water body. He stated there was nothing in the ordinance that prohibited the applicant from revegetating that area to bring it back to its natural state. He argued that they could put trails and there are exceptions in the ordinance, which does allow for non-impervious trails. Mr. Mullen indicated that he had the settlement agreement and there was a plan included which gave the pond a wide berth, and he was surprised that plan had wide berth unless they were aware of the 150-ft riparian buffer. They had it then, they changed it, then they were warned about it, and then they ignored it. That was why the Environment Commission (EC) suggests the board not grant the variance.

Mr. Preiss asked if the EC felt this would add to the enhancement of the protection of that waterbody is it is 150-ft as opposed to 50-ft.

Mr. Mullen felt it was more or less created an environment for the entire ecosystem, so there has to be life around it and in it. He believed there was sustain environmental benefit to not place those houses. He stated the EC would encourage them to revegetate it.

Ms. Cecil read the exception in compliance with the DEP. She stated that she felt, once revegetated, then they could not go in to mow it, which she felt would constitute as disturbance.

Ms. Kathy Easton, Shade Tree Commission Chairperson, residing at 12 Prospect Street, sworn, she commented about the tree canopy around the pond corrected the applicant's statement that 'just canopy' is entirely incorrect. She stated the structure of the tree projects well below the ground, having a network below the ground all the way to the drip line of the tree and beyond.

Mike Pisauro, Policy Director for the Watershed, sworn, he pointed out the flood hazard area rules have general rules that allows maintenance to vegetated areas. In addition, that allows for stream corridor restoration expectation E6 allows disturbance in accordance permit by rule and permits by certification in general permit. He asked Mr. Kruse asked if the pond was accepted by the NJDEP and asked if he was the one who did the delineation.

Mr. Kruse answered yes.

Mike Pisauro asked if the project was approved there would be regrading, and stormwater would be redirected away from that pond.

Mr. Kruse said yes, with the current plan.

Mr. Pisauro asked if he spoke with the farmer and asked if he did not know when the farmer last filled the pond with well water. Mr. Kruse said he did not. Mr. Pisauro asked if there were wetlands around the pond. Mr. Kruse answered yes. Mr. Pisauro asked, if the preferred plan, if the backyards would slope towards the wetlands and pond or away. Mr. Kruse stated they would slop towards the wetlands and pond, however he added, there would be rear collection system to capture water as a deflection system. Mr. Pisauro asked if that would be all the water or of design storm. Mr. Kruse stated is the design stormwater, 25" piping. Mr. Pisauro asked if that was for roof. Runoff or would there be inlets along the back. Mr. Kruse stated inlets, the intent is for them to drain the rear yards and the homes.

Mr. Pisauro asked about the concern for some stormwater over running into the pond and flowing toward and onto Petty Road. He asked how much water there would be needed for that situation, overflowing the drainage basins, pond, wetlands, etc., all the way to Cedar Brook onto Petty Road. Mr. Kruse said the question was Ms. Spann's on where the water would go if the pond over flowed, and basing off the topography, that natural overflow would be directed toward Cedar Brook. He added that would be the natural flow pattern.

Mr. Pisauro asked if currently it was flowing from Dey Road through the farm, through the wetlands, forest and tree cover, to the pond, back through wetlands, through trees, and any guess on how big the storm would have to be to overwhelm that. Mr. Kruse stated he could not tell him that, but it would have to be a big storm. Mr. Pisauro asked if there was such a big storm to overwhelm the drainage system would you say you are designing for the 25 – year storm, which would also cause flooding down stream. Mr. Kruse stated the residential site conforms to the standards which is the 100 – year storm at the tail end. The RSIS allows for the 25 – year storm, but the collection system must assure that the 100 – year storm it is deflected toward the basin and the end of the storm water system have to be able to accommodate the 100 – year flow.

Mr. Pisauro asked if the site itself would flood. Mr. Kruse stated the lower area would collect and flow into the wet ponds. Mr. Pisauro asked if bigger than the 100 – year storm would flood onto Petty Road. Mr. Kruse stated Pond A goes toward Petty Road and Pond B towards the Cedar Brook.

Mr. Pisauro asked if the applicant preformed a tree count for those within the property line, which would be affected. Mr. Kruse noted they only used arial photography. Mr. Pisauro asked if the applicant agreed with the Township Ordinance that lakes and ponds are the areas in need of protection. Mr. Kruse answered yes. Mr. Pisauro asked if the applicant did historical aerial photography to see how long the pond had been there. Mr. Kruse said the did not. Mr. Pisauro asked Mr. Kruse if he agreed with him if the riparian zone is repaired it would be vegetated. He asked about Toll Brothers routinely doing landscaping. Mr. Kruse noted there was, as part of their submission. Mr. Kruse mentioned he was not a landscape architect.

Mr. Pisauro noted that there really could be three alternative plans, third being not build those homes and restore the vegetation. Mr. Hoff stated he could answer for Toll Brothers and that would not be a proposed alternative plan. Mr. Pisauro stated it was physically possible. Mr. Kruse stated they could engineer anything.

Mr. Pisauro asked, when the concept plan was prepared, did you do the concept plan in support of the ordinance. Mr. Kruse stated he did not. Mr. Pisauro asked if the riparian zone was taken into consideration or not. Mr. Kruse said not during that process.

Michael Marciano, 10 Petty Road, sworn, stated the proposed project has given little information and their house resides toward the top of Petty Road and have lived there for 25 years and would like to know, is this a project that is moving forward for this lot.

Ms. Cecil stated the property was zoned for what they have proposed and with the exception of the encroachment into the riparian zone it is a fully conforming proposal. She noted the board would still have to be satisfied with the circulation, stormwater management, etc., if the applicant can satisfy the board that everything proposed works and is feasible and meets the legal requirements the board does not have the option of denying.

Mr. Marciano stated this was the first he has seen the plans. He heard a lot from proposed residents but nothing in relationship to the existing residents within the area. He valued the property in its present state.

Walter Ornberg, 39 Petty Road, sworn. Lives in the house on the corner of the farm and was concerned about the runoff.

Mr. Preiss mentioned Plan A is if the board grants the variance and Plan B is if the board does not grant the variance.

The applicant was being carried to April 2, 2020 at 7:00 P.M. and the applicant would not order a transcript, absent members would have to listen to the audio of the meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Hamlin for approval of the variance related to the riparian zone. Mr. Mavoides seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Hamlin, Mr. Mavoides
NAYS: Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Kaiser, Mr. Scott, Ms. Spann, Mr. Whittman
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Ms. Callahan, Mr. Stewart

MOTION FAILED

PB065-03/PB325-19 Alfieri – Half Acre Road LLC/North Parcel
Block 5, Lot 9, Zone LI
343 & 353 Half Acre Road
Preliminary and Final Subdivision

REPRESENTATIVES: Michael Butler, Esquire
Ralph Orlando, Engineer

EXHIBITS:

EXHIBITS A-1 Final Subdivision Plat for Half Acre North, prepared by Partner Engineering, dated January 24, 2020

Ms. Cecil stated that notice was adequate, and the board had jurisdiction to hear the matter.

All witness and board professionals were sworn.

Mr. Butler, standing in for Mr. Petrino, stated this was simply a subdivision application for finance purposes. They received one letter from Mr. Hoder and would address the letter.

Mr. Orlando gave a brief history of the previously approved of the site and a physical layout of the property. Mr. Orland made the changes mentioned in Mr. Hoder's report of February 2020 and Mr. Hoder found it satisfactory. Buildings would be located on the map. Cross access easements would be granted. There were not asking for any variances. They would locate the hot box.

Mr. Hoder preferred that the applicant file both by map and deeds because the deeds were what searchers used. He said the setbacks are larger than what was required by the ordinance and wanted all the easements for all entities, along with any environmental constraints, and buildings to be shown.

Motion made by Mr. Hamlin for approval of the preliminary and final site plan. Mr. Whitman seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Hamlin, Mr. Mavoides, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Kaiser, Mr. Scott, Ms. Spann, Mr. Whittman
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Ms. Callahan, Mr. Stewart

MOTION FAILED

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 at this moment certify;

That I am duly elected and acting secretary of the Cranbury Township Planning Board and that the other minutes of the Planning Board, held on March 5, 2020, consisting of ____ (__) 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 _____, 2020.

Josette C. Kratz, Secretary

/jck