

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

**SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES JULY 28, 2022
APPROVED ON SEPTEMBER 1, 2022**

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

The special meeting of the Cranbury Township Planning Board was held via Zoom <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86494062397> Meeting ID: 864 9406 2397 on July 28, 2022, at 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Michael Kaiser, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

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. 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.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

- Ferrante, Michael
- Gallagher, James
- Gittings, Bill
- Jones, Dominique
- Kaiser, Michael

- Mavoides, Peter
- Spann, Evelyn
- Stewart, Jason
- Wittman, Wayne

PROFESSIONALS IN ATTENDANCE

- Andrew Feranda, Traffic Consultant
- David Hoder, Board Engineer
- Elizabeth Leheny, Township Planner
- Robert Davidow, Esquire, Board Attorney
- Robin Tillou, Planning Board Administrative Officer

MINUTES

Upon a motion made and seconded the minutes of June 2, 2022 were unanimously approved.

APPLICATIONS

PB350-21 WuXi Apptec/Xenobiotic Labs
Block 1.02, Lot 4 – RO/LI Zone
6 Cedar Brook Drive
Preliminary and Final Site Plan Amendment – Nitrogen Tank/Concrete Pad

REPRESENTATIVES: Steven Slaven, Esq., Turp, Coates, Driggers & White, PC
 Matt Wisocky, WuXi Apptec/Xenobiotic Laboratories, Director of
 Facilities Management
 Robert Korkuch, ACT Engineers
 Sean Wang, WuXi

Mr. Davidow announced the notice was adequate and the Board can take jurisdiction.

Mr. Slaven, applicant's attorney, introduced the application by stating this applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the removal of the existing nitrogen tank and the construction of a concrete pad and the addition of a larger nitrogen tank.

Mr. Davidow swore in the Board's professionals.

Mr. Davidow swore in the Applicant's professionals.

Mr. Wisocky, WuXi Apptec/Xenobiotic Laboratories, Director of Facilities Management, stated this site is a testing laboratory. The use for the nitrogen is for LCMS platform (driving gas for the analysis of biological samples). WuXi Apptec runs tests and experiments on samples and the

products they sell are a report. The existing tank is a 3,000-liter tank. They are proposing a 3,000-gallon tank (four times the size of the existing). The proposed tank is for the reason of increasing the capacity within site and decrease the truck deliveries. Currently the site is getting a delivery once every 3 days and with the proposed tank it will be once every other week. The deliveries are typically during day hours. There is building lighting, but the lighting is not directly on the enclosure. If there is a night delivery, the trucks may require exterior lighting, but that comes from the truck itself. The tank has a fill station and valves that are relatively low. The truck backs up directly to there and they have a light on their truck, the hose comes out the back and then it fills.

Mr. Robert Korcuch, principal of ACT Engineer, advised the Board he is a licensed engineer and planner, has provided testimony to boards throughout NJ and parts of PA for 25 years. He has a bachelor's degree in civil engineering and a master's degree in civil engineering.

Chair Kaiser accepted Mr. Korcuch's credentials.

Mr. Korcuch displayed 6 Cedar Brook Drive – Nitrogen Tank Location. Mr. Korcuch showed the Board the location of the current tank and the proposed tank.

Mr. Korcuch displayed exhibit 7 – Photograph of existing tank.

Mr. Korcuch stated the existing tank is 10 ft. tall with the fence and yellow bollards. The proposed tank will be 17 ft. tall which is below the building height. The proposed tank will be similar with the bollards and installation.

Mr. Korcuch displayed the Landscape and Lighting Plan.

Mr. Korcuch stated along the north and south will be the landscaping. The Board Planner's review letter suggested that this area could be better screened with supplemental planting. The proposal is to put additional landscaping plantings in the north and the walkway areas around the lake and they will put additional plantings further away from the building to help screen that area.

Mr. Korcuch displayed Exhibit 5 – Twelve (12) photos from street view.

Mr. Sean Wang, WuXi, stated they will be increasing the fence size.

Mr. Gittings asked what a northern bay berry is.

Mr. Korcuch stated it is a landscape plant shrub and is an evergreen which will be bushy and be able to fill that area. At planting they will be three feet and the expectation are for them to grow to be 5 – 6 ft.

Chair Kaiser stated it is a deciduous plant.

Mr. Gallagher stated it is a good screening tree, he has one in his yard and is 12 ft.

Mr. Gittings asked of the dumpster enclosure details.

Mr. Korkuch stated that is the responsibility of the owner.

Mr. Wisocky stated there are currently four (4) dumpsters, 2 for trash and 2 for recycling. It is communal and for other tenants.

Mr. Gallagher asked the professional responsible for the equipment selection and installation of the tank.

Mr. Wisocky stated the vendor, "Air Gas" is responsible for the entire tank system, and they are responsible for the pressure release valves and everything associated with the tank itself. They will manifold prior to going into their building. WuXi is responsible for the piping from that point inside the building and throughout their building.

Mr. Gallagher requested the engineer that is responsible for the design to be present.

Mr. Korkuch stated the Township Construction Official for the municipality will review that with that professional engineering representation before it can be made operational.

Mr. Gallagher stated the Planning Board has jurisdiction for public safety.

Mr. Gallagher would like to be able to question the engineer responsible for the design of this.

Mr. Wittman stated he agreed with Mr. Gallagher that we should hear from someone that is installing the tank.

Mr. Hoder referred to his review letter dated July 20, 2022. Mr. Hoder stated the landscaping will grow large enough in a couple of years and is satisfied with the landscaping. The concern is the height of the tank versus the chain link fence due to the height of the proposed tank. The lighting is a concern where the tanks are. There is a 400-watt light on one side and a 100 watt on the other side. The applicant can do an analysis to what the lighting is in between as stated in his letter. It should be from .5 - 1 ft. candle around the tank. For the recycling and trash, this Board has been good at asking if the dumpster is inside a structure of some kind. There should be a second dumpster pad with sides.

Ms. Leheny stated the landscaping is satisfactory on the north and south side. The Board may want to request the owner of the development be at the meeting. The walking area is not great right now due to seeing the trash enclosure. Screening would be good to provide for those areas. The three different WuXi applications has recently come before the Board at 3 separate locations, how do the three communicate.

Mr. Wisocky stated there is no interactions due to being three separate companies.

Mr. Feranda did not have a traffic review due to no traffic or parking impact.

Mr. Wang asked if the tank is refilled in the evening.

Mr. Wisocky stated it is done during the day.

Mr. Ferrante stated he works in pharmaceutical, and he is not worried about the lighting due to the installation company doing this day in and day out. There are no concerns from his end that the truck has lighting and is consistent with their other operations.

Mr. Gittings stated as per Mr. Hoder, the height of the fence is an issue and there should be more landscaping on the walkway along the water. The bushes seem light.

Chair Kaiser stated he agrees with Mr. Gittings, a variety of plants for buffer helps. He recommends additional plantings.

Ms. Jones asked how far apart the bollards are.

Mr. Wang stated they are 5 ft apart. The 8 ft. height is the tallest they can get.

Mr. Hoder asked if the bollards are new, or they will be the existing bollards.

Mr. Wang stated they are existing.

Mr. Hoder recommends 4 ft. apart.

Mr. Feranda stated he is comfortable with the existing conditions that are out there now.

Ms. Spann stated the Wuxi sites are independent of each other, so they are not communicating on their site plan. We need symmetry and continuity in what we are approving. If we have approved a beige fence previously, we should approve a beige fence. The 8 ft. fence with a 17 ft. tank is a concern.

Chair Kaiser opened the meeting to the public. With no public comment Chair Kaiser closed the public forum.

Mr. Wittman does not see a concern of lighting if all deliveries are during the day.

Mr. Korcuch stated there will be an engineer brought in to speak about the tank and the installation. They can speak of the typical operation and find comfort in that.

Chair Kaiser and Ms. Spann agreed that the dumpsters are a non-issue due to being the landlord's responsibility.

Mr. Hoder asked if there is a wider or shorter tank available.

Mr. Wisocky stated no.

MOTION TO TABLE TO THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2022 MEETING WITH NO FURTHER

NOTICE: Mr. Wittman

SECONDED: Mr. Gallagher

ROLL CALL: Mr. Ferrante, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Gittings, Ms. Jones, Mr. Mavoides, Ms. Spann, Mr. Wittman and Mr. Kaiser

**PB337-21 Cranbury Self Storage, LLC
Block 16, Lot 9, Zone GC
116 S. Main Street
Preliminary and Final Site Plan**

REPRESENTATIVES: Frank Brennan, Esq., Brennan Law
Ernest Feist P.E., P.P., CME, Center State Engineering
Sharif Aly, Amer Tech Engineering
Mark Dean, Architect

EXHIBITS

A-1 – Color Rendering – Architectural Rendering

A-2 – 8 Sheets of Site Plan

A-3 – 6 Pages of Architectural Elevations

A-4 – Color Aerial View from NJDOT

A-5 – Site Plan – Layout and Dimension Plan

A-6 – Sign Exhibit

A-7 – 7 pages of Architectural Plans – 4-5-22

A-8 – Color Rendering

A-9 – Color Rendering of View from the North Side of the Property

Mr. Davidow announced this Board still has jurisdiction over this application and no new notice is required and all witnesses stay under oath.

Mr. Brennan continued this application from the June 2, 2022 hearing by stating the previous comments have been addressed and they have come back with a revised site plan that now has variances that were not needed previously. The variances are for the water fire connection and signage. There are revised architectural plans. Lastly there are revised renderings that will be shared, and the Board will be able to get the views that were requested.

Mr. Feist stated after the initial hearing they went back to the civil engineer, Mr. Aly, and the architect, Mr. Dean, to get updated architectural plans and renderings to address comments from the Board. They have provided an eight ft. planting bed and a six ft. walkway in front of the building. They have had communication with New Jersey American Water, and they now have a hot box and have provided landscaping around that. The hot box (utility facility) has now triggered a variance. The architect has amended his architectural plans, so the architectural plans and the site plan match up accordingly. They have eliminated the line that created two separate buildings. There are building one and building two now. The one-story building on the northerly side, is giving Brick Yard Road a plan to bring it closer to the property and further exposing that portion of the building to a collective road. The architect modified his façade design for that building and the engineer has modified the landscaping plan to provide landscaping along that building. There is now a monument sign detail that has triggered another variance for size.

Mr. Aly displayed Exhibit A-5 – Revised Site Plan.

Mr. Aly stated there is a typo on the plan that states they have added 130 ft. to the building, this is an error. The building size remains the same. The sliding gate has been extended and moved to allow for more space on building #1. Building #2 is the same, but it is no longer two buildings. It is still 9,850 sq. ft. The parking lot has been increased from the curb line to the face of the building from 6 ft. to 14 ft. The parking lot in the front shifted closer to S. Main Street by 8 ft. In the front parking area, they now have two-way traffic as opposed to the one way going north. They are added the EV space near the handicap space due to needing an EV space in the handicap area. They have increased the green spaces (banking spaces) by adding two spaces located on the right side of the building. There are 14 spaces in front of the building along S. Main Street and two green spaces in front of the office in the same area and nine spaces on the south side of building #1. The free-standing sign will be on the north side of the access driveway into the site and in the grass area between the right of way and the curb line of the parking area. The sign is 90 sq. ft., and the requirement is 50 sq. ft. The sign will be 11 ft. high. They have added an 8" water main that will be coming from the area of Brick Yard Road along S. Main Street. The hotbox is 7' wide by 20' deep. The hotbox will be in the front yard. There

will be a front yard setback variance requirement for the hotbox. The signage will need a variance due to the square footage of the sign.

Mr. Aly displayed exhibit A-6 – Sign Exhibit.

Mr. Aly stated the electronic portion of the sign on the bottom is 36” in height. Above that you have the standard sign which is the Cranbury Storage portion and is 60” (5’) in height. The width of the sign is 120”. All fire requirements are met. The electronic portion of the sign is part of the marketing due to S. Main Street speed limit being 45 MPH and this will give the motorist the ability to look at the sign at night and during the day. The dumpster will remain where it is due to the dumpster only being used by the office space employees. The dumpster is 10 x 10. There will be walls and landscaping around the dumpster. They would like the dumpster as close as possible to the front office, so it is in reach of the employee. The resident to the south on Main Street is 200 – 300 ft. south of building #1. There is heavy vegetation associated with the wetlands. All that vegetation is on the applicant’s property. It will stay and not be disturbed. The landscaping was added to the northside of building #2. The fire and disposal truck movement has been added to the plans as requested.

Mr. Davidow swore in Mr. Mark Dean, Architect for applicant.

Mark Dean stated he is licensed architect in NJ for 28 years and licensed in 33 states including NJ. He has testified as an architect and expert witness at other boards in NJ. They have been creating self-storage projects for 15 years.

Chair Kaiser accepted Mr. Dean’s qualifications.

Mr. Dean displayed exhibit A-7 – Architectural Plans (7 Sheets) dated 4-5-22.

Mr. Dean stated the floor plan changes are breaking the building down to elements and adding details to the west elevation with the primary materials being stone and an exterior finish system. The outside material has been changed to adding more stone to for accents and to break it down to smaller sizes. The front façade materials are stone, glass and exterior insulation finish system (stucco). The south elevation on the corner piece of the office area, the glass turns the corner, the stone turns the corner, the accent band is across the top with the bracket molding and then transitions into a metal panel siding. The north elevation at the corner introduces the stone and window bans down this elevation to help break it up into smaller pieces so the stone would match the stone in the front and the metal panel would match the metal panel on the rest of the building. The eastern elevation is strictly a metal panel.

Mr. Dean displayed A-8 – Color Rendering.

Mr. Dean stated this exhibit shows the west side of building from the south corner of the property. There are windows that have been added in the front that go into the upper storage areas and breaks up the front façade. The left corner or north side of the building is an EIFS material applied and put in with assorted colors. A pediment has been added on top of that piece with smaller detailed bracketing helping bring the scale down. The left-hand side will show building #2. The materials have been bought over from building #1.

Mr. Dean displayed exhibit A-9 – Color Rendering of North Side View of Building.

Mr. Dean stated they have added more of a landscaping feature along the front of the building enlarged to 8 ft. to help with the scale of the three-story building. They have added in the front and in the middle of the north side of building #1 the pieces to break up the elevation with the stone, a roof detail and windows that opens into the storage corridors to bring natural light into the building.

Ms. Leheny stated this is a gateway site that is highly visible. The review of the revised plans by the architects at her firm stated the building should be simplified. If there is more agreement or desire to have a more simplified form or materials her review letter can give the applicant and the Board specifics.

Chair Kaiser stated EIFS are not permitted.

Ms. Leheny stated the signage has two portions, the static sign and the electronic movable tech sign below that. In the new sign ordinance electronic message display signs are not permitted in any zone. The two portions together equal 90 sq. ft. and 50 sq. ft. are permitted in the zone. The sign would have to change to be more complimentary to the building. Is the static sign going to be strongly lit? Are there plans for internal illumination?

Mr. Feist stated it is a translucent sign and internally illuminated.

Ms. Leheny stated it would be preferable to have exterior or ground lighting, illuminating the sign from below.

Mr. Feist stated they are amendable to what the Board would want for the sign.

Mr. Dean stated the EIFS is essentially a stucco application. It is a method of applying the stucco that puts the insulation on the outside of the building which gives a continuous insulation barrier then a mesh goes up and a stucco like finish gets applied to that.

Chair Kaiser stated it states in the ordinance that EIFS is not permitted.

Mr. Dean stated they can achieve the same aesthetics using a more traditional stucco installation.

Ms. Leheny stated her review letter was to simplify rather than add more detail.

Mr. Hoder went over his review letter dated July 21, 2022. He would like feedback from the engineer for the conservation easement and bollards. The disposal waste and screening should be placed on the plan now and not later. Doing the 14 ft. wide area near the building is a good addition to provide the sidewalk and the landscape strip at the building will look nicer. Will the landscape have 75% of the plantings to be evergreen per the ordinance?

Mr. Aly stated the conservation easement will be addressed with the state later and they will comply with all items in Mr. Hoder's review letter. Item #6 item b. from Mr. Hoder's review letter complies and will provide calculations to that for the tree issue. All other items on #6 they will comply. It is difficult to comply with the item for the 75% evergreen. If they try to comply with the 75% then they would have to change all shrubs on site to evergreens. A design waiver for that is requested. The rest of 7 and 8 is stormwater and they will comply with that.

Mr. Hoder is ok with the design waiver for 75% of the plantings being evergreens.

Mr. Hoder feels they should supply the community impact statement.

Mr. Hoder stated per ordinance any pipes under 30" must be upsized by one size, the exit pipe going down S. Main is smaller. It cannot be upsized due to taking place of the ditch that is there now. That is also a waiver that should be granted due to the physical distance, and it is good the pipe is smaller so less flow will be coming from this site and effect the neighborhood less.

Mr. Feranda went over his review letter dated July 25, 2022. Mr. Feranda stated the site has frontage along Route 539, have you gone to the county yet to discuss the site for widening? There is a guide rail that would have to be removed to make the widening work.

Mr. Feist stated they have not made an application to Middlesex County for approval. They will comply with the requirements of the County.

Mr. Feranda stated the sign would be placed on the green grassy area to the left of the entrance. The sign does not look like it would be in a site triangle. A message at the bottom of the sign rendering states auction, is there going to be auctions done at the property?

Mr. Feist stated there can be an auction of materials of an abandoned storage unit and this is done in the Monroe location where the parking has sufficed.

Mr. Feranda stated the NJDOT is planning to realign the circle and he would like to know how far the building will be from the road of self-storage that will be adjacent off the property line. This should be scaled on the plan.

Mr. Feist stated they can add the length from the road to the building on the plan.

Mr. Feranda stated bollards were installed around the building at the entrance locations, can there be striping provided at the entrances to show pedestrians?

Mr. Feist stated yes.

Mr. Gallagher stated in the Environmental Impact Statement it states the commercial and industrial history of the property. The existing conditions plan is based on a boundary survey done in 2015 and an aerial photograph done in 2003. Things have changed on the property since 2003. Was there any environmental due diligence associated with the acquisition of this property.

Mr. Feist stated they acquired the property several years ago and as part of that acquisition the prior property owner did a phase 1 environmental which was provided to them and there were no concerns of the property. The changes have taken place due to the home and the property being in a state of disrepair. They felt it was prudent to do a routine demo and take those structures down and that permit was obtained through the Cranbury Building Department.

Mr. Gallagher stated there is a debris pile which is an area of concern and an existing soil pile.

Mr. Gallagher stated certain industrial activities would trigger the Industrial Site Reuse Act (ISRA). Were any of those activities included in what happened at the site.

Mr. Brennan stated the IRSA is triggered if there is an industrial establishment that ceases operations that fits a particular NAICS code. And when this property was purchased, it was ensured that all NJ requirements were satisfied.

Mr. Feist stated that is correct and they are not aware of any previous industrial use.

Mr. Gallagher stated if there was a dwelling there had to be a water supply and an onsite well since there is no water supply on the property.

Mr. Feist stated if they did find a well, they would close them in accordance with the law of NJ and they received a demolition permit and complied with the demolition permit.

Mr. Gallagher asked if the septic system was properly closed.

Mr. Feist stated the contractor that completed the demolition contacted Middlesex County Health Department, the well was capped, and the septic system was decommissioned.

Chair Kaiser would like proof of the decommission from the County of the septic system as part of the condition.

Mr. Wittman stated for the well too.

Mr. Gallagher stated the soil pile is due to soil being available to the contractor that performed the demolition, and that soil was extra from that. They have filed for a Freehold Soil Conservation District approval to temporarily stockpile that pending site plan approval. He will look in the records to find out where the soil came from.

Mr. Gallagher asked if the additional soil being brought in will be imported.

Mr. Feist stated the material being used for the stockpile will be used and Mr. Aly's calculations were not including that stockpile.

Mr. Aly stated that is correct.

Mr. Feist stated initially they were going to rely on the import, but with the excess soil on the site, they are now at a balance.

Mr. Gallagher stated he would like to see the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.

Mr. Hoder stated Cranbury has a soil permit ordinance and the building inspector should enforce that ordinance. That must be part of a compliance item.

Mr. Wittman stated if mass quantities of soil are being bought in then they must bring in the ordinance. The demo of the home is something different.

Mr. Feist stated when the soil was acquired to fill in the basement of the house, there was excess soil and was stock piled. The zoning officer contacted him and asked the purpose of the soil. He asked that Freehold Soil Conservation District approval be done.

Mr. Davidow stated if the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment can be provided that can put these discussions to bed.

Mr. Wittman stated the digital component of the sign is a no go and they seem to be willing to eliminate that and comply. We had asked the applicant to bring contrast to the outside of the building and they did what they thought we would like to see. It may or may not be the taste of everyone on the board. He likes the design, but it may be more than we need for the town.

Mr. Gittings stated he would like more detail on the American Water construction.

Mr. Feist stated their first thought was to put it further back on the property, but they are at the mercy of the water company. It is 5 ft. tall and a metal enclosure. They have provided landscaping around it. They have proposed to the utility company they would put it in the facility, but they did not want that.

Chair Kaiser stated that is standard. They are larger than a transformer due to containing the backflow balance for the fire distribution system. They need to be bigger for someone to enter and service that component.

Ms. Leheny stated this should not need a variance.

Chair Kaiser believes it does.

Mr. Mavoides stated Cranbury adopted a hot box ordinance, so these do not become a variance.

Mr. Gittings asked what type of stone it is.

Mr. Dean stated it is a culture stone, a concrete border. It is mortar. The metal siding is a standard 28 gage metal panel corrugated.

Mr. Gittings asked if the structure is a pre-engineered building.

Mr. Dean stated it is not a pre-engineered building, there are companies that make the building and ship the components to the site. It is not the big frames that you see on the pre-engineered buildings.

Mr. Gittings asked what the stucco cornice is.

Mr. Dean stated it is a band of stucco along the main portion of the building. The bracketry at the two ends will be a PVC material.

Mr. Gittings stated Cranbury has a history of agriculture and industrial buildings and it is important to visit Cranbury. The ordinance has provided a specific design standard for the buildings. He does not feel this current design meets the ordinance of the design standard. He feels a site visit would be helpful in the type of building Cranbury is looking for.

Mr. Jones stated she listened to the previous hearing's recording due to being absent, and she feels the environmental aspects do need to be dealt with. She objects to the sign and feels it is out of character.

Mr. Ferrante stated his concern is the sign as well and it should match the building.

Mr. Aly stated they received LOI with a 50 ft. Buffer. They may down the road do minor grading in the case of the retaining wall. Some of the encroachment in the buffer is due to existing trails. They believe they will be improving the buffer and restoring the vegetation. They may have to go to the state for that.

Mr. Spann stated it is a disadvantage that the architect did not visit Cranbury. You will have a visible location due to the circle renovation. We must make sure the building does not look cheap after a period from wear and tear. She would like to see the Community Impact Statement (CIS).

Chair Kaiser would also like to see a CIS due to neighboring properties having to go through that process. The building should be simplified. The hot box is an issue, but he has been fighting the battle for the hot boxes and he hopes the applicant will do what is best to hide that.

Chair Kaiser opened the meeting to the public. With no public comment, Chair Kaiser closed the public forum.

MOTION TO TABLE THE APPLICATION TO OCTOBER 6, 2022 WITH NO NEW

NOTICE: Ms. Spann

SECONDED: Mr. Ferrante

By unanimous vote, the applicant has been tabled to the scheduled date of October 6, 2022 at 7 pm with no new notice.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Kaiser opened the meeting to the public; with no public comment the public comment was closed.

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

There being no further business, Mr. Stewart made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Wittman offered a second. By unanimous vote, the meeting was thereupon adjourned at 11:00 pm.

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 minutes of the Planning Board, held on July 28, 2022, consisting of fifteen (15) 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 September 2, 2022.

Robin Tillou
Robin Tillou, Administrative Officer

/rst