

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

**MINUTES NOVEMBER 5, 2020
APPROVED ON JANUARY 7, 2021**

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

The regular meeting of the Cranbury Township Planning Board was held via the ZOOM virtual meeting platform on November 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 AND STATEMENT REGARDING PUBLIC COMMENTS

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 (published in the Times of Trenton on 10/24/2020). 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.

Comments or questions sent via chat will not be accepted and will not be made part of the record or minutes.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

P Callahan, Karen
P Gallagher, James
P Hamlin, Judson
P Kaiser, Michael
P Scott, Matt
P Spann, Evelyn
P Stewart, Jason
P Wittman, Wayne
P 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

RESOLUTION

PB330-20 Prologis – 6 Santa Fe Way
Block 7, Lot 8.01, Zone LI
6 Santa Fe Way
Preliminary & Final Site Plan with variance relief for parking

Mr. Hamlin motioned for approval of the resolution. Mr. Gallagher seconded the

ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Hamlin, Mr. Kaiser, Mr. Scott, Ms. Spann, Mr. Mavoides
NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: Ms. Callahan, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Wittman (all three members were ineligible to vote)

ABSENT None

MOTION PASSED

APPLICATION

PB332-20 Amazon/Half Acre – Alfieri
Block 5, Lot 9, Zone LI
343 Half Acre Road
Amended Final Major Site Plan

REPRESENTATIVES: Joseph A Paparo, Esquire
Fritz Timm, Amazon
Ralph Orlando, PE –
Michael Golias, Traffic Consultant
John Krell
Sean Moronski, Planner

All professionals for Applicant and Board were sworn.

Mr. Paparo explained that application before the board was a request for an amended site plan along with variances and design waivers in connection with the existing warehouse building and site, located at 343 Half Acre Road. Amazon is seeking modification to the site, involved striping, modification in the parking and loading areas, lighting and signage changes. Those improvements require some variances and design waivers as noted by the Board's planner. Testimony tonight would address those variances and design waivers. They have received reports from Mr. Hoder, Mr. Preiss, and Mr. Feranda. Applicant's team would address those reports as part of the presentation.

Mr. Paparo stated the testimony this evening would be more technical than operational and introduced Mr. Orlando to the Board.

Mr. Orlando, credentials accepted, stated (using Exhibit A-1, dated November 5, 2020, Rendering of Site Layout Plan, Sheet 1) what the drawing represented and gave the orientation of the plan in relationship to the site. All of the changes are affiliated with signage, striping and lighting within the fundamental improvement area of the site. The project was modified as follows; A. Added bollards, striping, stop bar, and stop sign at that location for traffic control. B. Modification of the striping, adding a five foot wide pedestrian walk path on the topside of the

‘bubbled in’ area in order to provide a safe area in order to provide a safe area for pedestrians to walk from north to south. They had to shift the striping to the east about five feet, the design waiver was previously granted for the striping, asking for a zero foot. Letter C - Guardhouse area, which is under construction, asking for additional walkway path striping to product guards and those walking around the area. E. Added stop bar and stop sign, F. Represents two located crosswalks. Letter G - Another crosswalk. H. Summary in center of building representing the fact they area reducing the amount of parking from 351 visitor/associate parking spaces to 343, the eight space loss is all because of the various improvements being made. Letter D - Is the area where a temporary guardhouse has been installed and asking for striping in the area for walking safety.

Mr. Orlando stated, Exhibit 2, dated November 5, 2020, Proposed Lighting Modifications, Sheet 1 of lighting plan. Red areas denoted previously approved lighting and Green represents what is being requested as part of this application. Summary chart at lower portion of the drawing in red details and schedule of proposed fixtures. The purpose for adding additional lighting and request for design waivers and variances was for meeting Amazon standards for the lighting they find necessary for operating their building appropriately.

Mr. Orlando stated that on the far northerly side, in the red area, that curb area they reduced the lighting 1-foot candle to 0.9-foot candle.

Mr. Golias, sworn and credentials accepted, (using Exhibit A-1) stated he was brought in to help with the signage and striping design for this project and to be consistent with their signage and striping program. All for the safety of pedestrian, associates, and trucks; both from increased visibility, having designated walking corridors and correct wayfinding. They also proposed two wall mounted façade sign located on the south side of the building. Those signs would require variance for the numbers signs (two) and the size of the signs (97 SF and 330 SF). Sheet SS504 from previously submitted plans, entitled signage and striping details, prepare by Langan, dated August 26, 2020. This is the elevation and the signs are the tenant standard. First sign is the Amazon logo located directly over the main entrance and the second sign was the Amazon name and the logo on the eastern side of the southern façade. The signs were internally illuminated. This sign package was their there typical signage proposed for this type of facility. There were no changes to the wayfinding signs as previously approved.

Mr. Moronski, sworn and credentials accepted, testified the reasoning for the signage as proposed. The signs were located where most easily identifiable from Half Acre Road and surrounding area, making it easier, safer and more efficient identification. They have variances related to the signage because of the magnitude of the facility the signage would be difficult to identified the site under the current ordinances. Total was less than 2% of the total wall area, these signs clearly will not overwhelm the façade. He believed the variances served the purpose of the MLUL, allowing for identification in a safer and more efficient circulation to and from the site. There was no substantial determine to the public good.

Mr. Hoder commented on lighting, which was high around the guardhouse, and the applicant has reduced it by about 50%. The foot-candles at property lines should not affect the neighbors, who are also in the industrial area. Have requested Mr. Orland remove the comment clouds on the site plans, but Mr. Orlando felt those changes necessary for the contractors. There is additional information on the details for Mr. Hoder to review.

Mr. Feranda noted the new site plan has added speed bumps in the parking areas for traffic control. He requested some testimony on why they are being used.

Mr. Golias stated the tenant standards were proposing speed bumps within the southern car parking lots, seven proposed within close proximity to the crosswalks, as part of their overall safety standards.

Mr. Feranda asked if their locations would be easily identifiable, should it snow and snowplows have to plow the parking area. Mr. Golias stated there would be signs adjacent to both for them. The speedbumps would be adjacent to all the crosswalks, which are identified with pedestrian crossing signs and sign located the speedbumps.

Mr. Feranda asked about the former loading area converted parking spaces west/south west parking area and asked for an explanation of the bollards and striping. Mr. Golias stated in the conversation of those loading areas to car spaces they want to shrink the space that the vehicles have. By providing the bollards it becomes a physical barrier which constricts the vehicle path down to 24-ft which is the appropriate width for a vehicle to travel within and direct them to the stop sign and stop bar at a proper controlled intersection so they do not have a free for all at the parking lot.

Mr. Feranda was satisfied with the applicant's reasoning based on comments asked in Mr. Feranda's review memo. Signalized intersection was expected February 2021, according to Mr. Orlando.

Mr. Preiss felt the lighting was appropriate. He felt in this situation with the addition of the crosswalks which guide people to building entrances, and appreciated the changes made so people could efficiently cross the driveways and get to the buildings. He mentioned, with regard to the signage, many have been granted and as far as the number of signs; examples with two frontages many ask for a wall sign on each of those frontages as opposed to two signs on one frontage (façade). He understands the reason for requesting this and given the scale of the building and the intent of the signage, he did not have an issue with the request. The topic of illumination would be address in the new sign regulations, traditionally internally illuminated signs were not considered appropriate in Cranbury, even in Industrial zones. However, the experience in Cranbury, has granted channel cut letters and felt it was appropriate and has granted the approvals in other situations so he did not have an issues with approving that. The size he felt was appropriate also for how large a building this is.

Mr. Scott asked about the individual fixtures and asked if they would be LED fixtures. Mr. Scott asked the height of the signage, answered that SMILE was 8-ft 3-in, AMAZON was 10-ft. Mr. Scott mentioned that the scale on the older buildings looks absurd in scale with the size of the buildings, and appreciate the offer to scale back the signs and felt that was appropriate.

The floor was opened to the public and there were no comments.

Mr. Mavoides summarized that the applicant agreed to lower the signs to 150-FT, changing the required variance. Mr. Gallagher mentioned that Mr. Hoder was going to review the safety aspects with parking against the building

Mr. Stewart motioned for approval of the application. Mr. Scott seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL

AYES: Ms. Callahan, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Hamlin, Mr. Kaiser, Mr. Scott, Ms. Spann, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Wittman, Mr. Mavoides

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT None

MOTION PASSED

DISCUSSION ITEMS

An informal presentation by Richard Preiss PP, and discussion on proposed amendments to the Cranbury Land Use Development Ordinance related to signage

Ms. Spann introduced Mr. Preiss, stating that this sign ordinance stemmed from a recommendation in the Master Plan Re-Evaluation. Mr. Preiss gave a brief overview and Ms. Spann explained to the board that this would be a workshop item for the December Planning Board meeting and urged the members for their input at that meeting.

Mr. Mavoides asked for public comments.

Mr. Nikitiades was concerned about his lottery sign.

Mr. Ingegneri asked when this would be available for public review. Ms. Spann mentioned that would be a question for Ms. Kratz, Mr. Ingegneri interrupted and mentioned Mr. Preiss perhaps could answer the question. Mr. Preiss mentioned Ms. Kratz has the draft and Township

Committee and the Board received a copy. Ms. Kratz stated most likely immediately, she would send to Ms. Golisano and Ms. Rubin to post on the website. Mr. Ingegneri thanked everyone, but stated this has been devastating (COVID) and we (business community) are working at it.

Mr. Mavoides closed the public.

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, did 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 November 5, 2020, consisting of seven pages (7) 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 January 7, 2021.

Josette C. Kratz, Secretary

/jck