

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

**MINUTES AUGUST 1, 2019
APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 7, 2019**

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 August 1, 2019, at 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Michael Kaiser, Vice-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

- ☐ Callahan, Karen (Excused)
- ☒ Gallagher, James
- ☒ Hamlin, Judson
- ☒ Johnson, Glenn
- ☒ Kaiser, Michael
- ☐ Mavoides, Peter (Excused)
- ☒ Mulligan, Dan
- ☐ Stewart, Jason (Excused)
- ☐ Witt, Nancy (Excused)

PROFESSIONALS IN ATTENDANCE

- ☐ Andrew Feranda, Traffic Consultant

- ☒ David Hoder, Board Engineer
- ☒ Trishka Cecil, Esquire, Board Attorney
- ☒ Josette C. Kratz, Secretary
- ☒ Richard Preiss, Township Planner
- ☐

RESOLUTIONS

PB 065-03 Alfieri – Half Acre Road
 Block 5, Lot 9, Zone LI
 353 Half Acre Road
 Amended Preliminary/Final Major Site Plan

Ms. Cecil stated the change was for Condition #2 on Page 10, which dealt with the traffic signalization installation on Half Acre Road and Liberty Way. The other change which Mr. Petrino and she discussed was the applicant provided cross-easements between Buildings 1 and 2; everything is under common ownership presently, and she and he did not think it was necessary.

	MOTION	ROLL CALL
Callahan, Karen		ABSENT
Gallagher, James		AYE
Hamlin, Judson		AYE
Johnson, Glenn	MOTIONED	AYE
Kaiser, Michael		INELIGIBLE
Mavoides, Peter		ABSENT
Mulligan, Dan	SECONDED	AYE
Stewart, Jason		ABSENT
Witt, Nancy		ABSENT
	RESULTS	Passed

PB306-18 Penske Trucking Plan
 Block 7, Lot 22, 23.01 & 23.02, HC Zone

2682, 2684 & 2686 Route 130
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan

There were no changes made.

	MOTION	ROLL CALL
Callahan, Karen		ABSENT
Gallagher, James		INELIGIBLE
Hamlin, Judson	MOTIONED	AYE
Johnson, Glenn	SECONDED	AYE
Kaiser, Michael		INELIGIBLE
Mavoides, Peter		ABSENT
Mulligan, Dan		AYE
Stewart, Jason		ABSENT
Witt, Nancy		ABSENT
	RESULTS	Passed

ORDINANCE REVIEW/DISCUSSION

CRANBURY TOWNSHIP ORDINANCE# 07-19-12 AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF CRANBURY, IN MIDDLESEX COUNTY, NEW JERSEY, AMENDING AND REVISING CHAPTER 150-32 AND 150-34, THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE

Mr. Preiss gave a brief overview of the proposed ordinance and his opinion was that even though it was not specifically consistent in the current Master Plan, it certainly was not inconsistent.

Ms. Cecil reminded the Board that when they review these ordinances, the primary task is to identify and point out to the Governing Body any substantial inconsistencies.

Mr. Mulligan questioned the setbacks being different for the village vs. the rest of the residential zones.

Mr. Preiss stated the justification was based on lot sizes and limitations of smaller lot sizes.

Mr. Mulligan felt this ordinance was inconsistent with other properties in the residential zones. It should be consistent with all the residential zones.

Motion made per the following recommendations:

- I. The Cranbury Township Planning Board Reviewed Ordinance #07-19-12 and found no substantial inconsistencies with the Cranbury Township Master Plan.
- II. The Cranbury Township Planning Board recommended that the Township Committee examine the 35% rear yard coverage limitation to make sure 35% is the correct threshold.
- III. The Cranbury Township Planning Board recommended that the Township Committee consider reducing the setback for accessory structures to four feet in all the residential zones, instead of only the V-C and V/HR zones, for the sake of consistency and uniformity.

	MOTION	ROLL CALL
Callahan, Karen		ABSENT
Gallagher, James		AYE
Hamlin, Judson		AYE
Johnson, Glenn	SECONDED	AYE
Kaiser, Michael	MOTIONED	AYE
Mavoides, Peter		ABSENT
Mulligan, Dan		AYE
Stewart, Jason		ABSENT
Witt, Nancy		ABSENT
	RESULTS	Passed

APPLICATIONS

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
Amended Preliminary Subdivision & Preliminary Major Site Plan

REPRESENTATIVES: Frank Petrino, Esquire
Radim Kucera, P.E.
James Rick Gilland, Architect
Adam Alexander, Landscaper

EXHIBIT A-1 Sheet 2 as marked with ink from the engineer, existing conditions
EXHIBIT A-2 Overall Site and Subdivision Plan
EXHIBIT A-3 Rendered Landscaping Plan, Color, no date
EXHIBIT A-4 Sight Line Study, June 24, 2019
EXHIBIT A-5 Vantage Point, June 24, 2019, Identifies viewpoint on rendering
EXHIBIT A-6 View from Route 130

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

Mr. Petrino gave a brief overview of the property. The property was previously granted subdivision approval which has been extended, as noted on Sheet 2, Note #2 (all of the significant improvements that have been constructed) in the plans provided. The applicant seeking amended preliminary subdivision approval to reconfigure and reduce the number of lots within this planned development to three (3) lots, known as reconfigured lot 6.01 for 30.37 acres located in South Brunswick, Lot 2.01 total 141 acres located partially within Cranbury and South Brunswick, Lot 2.02 total 100 acres situated in Cranbury. The applicant is also seeking preliminary site plan approval to construct on Lot 2.01 within Cranbury a warehouse facility, 1,393,004 SF and located within that structure will be 27,860 SF of office space. Lot 2.02 would comprise of a proposed 1,052,328 SF of warehouse with 21,047 SF office space. There would be two entrances to the planned development from Cranbury South River Road, one with full movements and the other right in-right out. There would be two types of signage; the entrance signs are free-standing monument with one at each of the access points and directional signs within the park.

There was a question about fences, gates, guardhouse, etc., they are not seeking approval at this time for those improvements (noted on plans as potential improvements). There would be 433 automobile parking spaces; ordinances allow a maximum of 384 spaces, so a waiver is being requested. They have suggested 262 dock loading spaces and 302 trailer spaces. Building 2 (smaller of the two buildings) would have 332 parking spaces, and the maximum in the ordinance is 290 spaces, so another waiver is being requested. There would be 190 dock spaces and 219 trailer spaces. There would be lighting, landscaping improvements. The bulk of the stormwater management system has been constructed and in place. They are asking the Board to

consider extended vesting of ten-years; it may not be necessary for today's market. However, they are making that request. They are also making a request; to the extent, there are any submission waivers and designs waivers, eighteen are known, and however, there may be more as they go through the professionals' reports. There are no variances. The applicant was granted conditional County site plan approval.

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

Mr. Kucera introduced himself, and his credentials were accepted. Mr. Kucera testified that he prepared and supervised the site plans and the stormwater management report,/operation maintenance manual, and solid waste and recycling management plan. He stated what the prior approvals and work performed on the site were.

Mr. Kucera explained the details of the history and construction of the existing stormwater management structures.

Mr. Gallagher wanted verification/evaluation on the current wetlands, stating wetlands could have developed in the interim period. Mr. Hoder said a presence/absence would be the easiest.

EXHIBIT A-1	Sheet 2 as marked up
EXHIBIT A-2	Sheet 4 as marked up

Mr. Preiss stated there would be a condition for cross-access easements, utility easements, etc.

Mr. Kucera stated there would be about 1.7 acres being dedicated to the County. They proposed the extension of two existing water lines, two - 12-inch main pipe uncapped at the end of the drive at South River Road. Using Duncan Drive, which extends all the way to the property line and an emergency exist. They will block the emergency exits from public use.

Mr. Kucera testified with regard to the stormwater management.

EXHIBIT A-3 Rendered Landscape Plan, Exhibit B, prepared specially for this evening's meeting, no date (Ms. Cecil ask the applicant to mark it with today's date)

Mr. Kucera explained the primary and secondary purpose of the basins, recharge, and dry wells. There will be landscaping to screen from the road and decoration. There are smaller berms adjacent to the ponds, about Pond A (4 to 5 FT) and Pond B (5 FT). Mr. Preiss asked about the protection (example: fencing) around the basins and Mr. Kucera did not think there were any specific issues of access and accessibility.

Mr. Hoder stated he did not see a lot of crosswalks in the areas where there are car parking. The radiance does require, can the applicant provide.

Mr. Kucera asked about crosswalks within the passenger car area? Mr. Hoder said yes, and required to be a different surface. Mr. Petrino said they could explore that, but the applicant's concern was the users walking the shortest distance and don't end up using the crosswalks.

Mr. Hoder agreed with not installing sidewalks on Route 130. In terms of lighting, there are areas in which Mr. Hoder felt the light was not adequate, as mentioned in the review memo. Mr. Kucera would address the internal intersections. Mr. Hoder suggested two waivers; concrete piping where the applicant is asking for black polyethylene pipe which he had no problem with it. Mr. Hoder stated the applicant is placing some of the pipeline underneath curbing, which Cranbury has granted the waiver on other projects.

Ms. Cecil asked if it was listed as a waiver on the application. Ms. Cecil said it would be the applicant's burden to create a record on the waivers needed and why they were necessary.

Mr. Petrino stated he thought there were twenty-one waivers requested, this one would be inclusive.

Mr. Kucera felt the soil calculations would be balanced, and they could make the soil work on the site. Mr. Hoder stated that was not what the calculations showed. Mr. Kucera said there would be changes on the site, Mr. Hoder stated they should be noted at this time.

Mr. Gilland testified as to the architectural elements of the site plan. The building would be concrete tilt-wall construction, accent panels, aluminum glass storefront or curtain wall with aluminum canopies, in and around the office corners.

EXHIBIT A

Mr. Gillard addressed the items mentioned in Mr. Preiss's review memo. The dumpsters are a roll-off containers that are hauled off, and tenant-specific. There is not an intent to create an enclosure. However, they are screened from the public view; intermingled where the trailers are and up against the building. Mr. Preiss asked if they were coming back to the Board after a tenant was identified to show the locations. Mr. Gillard stated they were not providing an enclosure, and the screening would be the same as screening for the loading dock doors. Mr. Preiss asked if the applicant was requesting the Board to approve this plan without any screening. Mr. Gillard stated, yes. Mr. Hoder pointed out that there are boxes noted at the ends where the curtain walls are located. Mr. Gillard said those were the locations.

Mr. Kaiser asked for a list of items being deferred to final approval; guard shack, fences, dumpsters, etc. In the end, he wanted a list summary of all things.

Mr. Gillard stated they had two entrances to the park around 1,800 FT apart, and they are proposing for identification of the park; both are setback from the roadway and more substantial than the ordinance allows. The idea being the size of the buildings themselves is substantial, and the site is extensive. Yet, the allowable sign is small in comparison to the monument sign doesn't look in scale with the industrial park. The overall height of the sign is 6' 8", the ordinance allows 6'. The total area allowed by ordinance is 60 SF maximum, and they are closer to 65 SF. Mr. Preiss pointed out the applicant had initially proposed a sign somewhere around 100' long, where the DRC asked for them to reduce, and they have done so. Mr. Gillard said the signs would only mark the park name, not the individual tenants.

Mr. Petrino listed waivers:

1. Free-standing general identification signs, whereas one per road frontage is permitted. Applicant asking for two signs.
2. General identification signs of being larger than 60-SF in area
3. To allow directory or internal wayfinding signs to exceed the maximum area of 16 SF, per sign. Proposed 28 SF.
4. Directory wayfinding signs of being located closer than the required 50 feet from the cartway.

Mr. Preiss stated the Board needs precise numbers for all signs and waivers.

Mr. Petrino stated they would be back at final with the signs.

Mr. Hoder asked about lighting. Mr. Gillard stated they would be ground lit signs, not internally illuminated.

Mr. Preiss asked if they would be located parallel, also asked about specific colors. Mr. Gillard said paint chip colors are not necessarily specific or the same, so they would like to be close. Mr. Preiss suggested approval later.

Ms. Cecil suggested that the degree of detail be deferred to final approval. Otherwise, they will be asking for an amended preliminary approval.

Mr. Preiss stated they would need a materials board with a specific color and would be entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Petrino stated they would bring back the additional signage information for the next meeting or defer until final approval.

Mr. Gallagher asked about the height of the loading dock. Mr. Feranda stated 13 FT was the standard. He added that he had seen the measurement as low as 12 FT.

Mr. Kaiser opened the floor to the public.

Lia Mastropolo, Stony Brook Watershed, she noted Cranbury was in the headwater zone and the uppermost portion upstream. The non-structural stormwater rules say after developments like this the natural hydrology should be mimicked as much as possible, and are there more ways to do that. She asked if there could be more swales. Mr. Kucera explained, due to the nature of this development, it would be almost impossible. Ms. Mastropolo asked about a "foreby"? Mr. Kucera said the maintenance manual speak of the maintenance that would be performed, including handling of sediment control. Ms. Mastropolo asked about the eco-grace, oil separator, and grass buffer for geese control lacks in a maintenance plan.

Ms. Cecil stated they were still missing vital information.

Mr. Petrino asked for the application to be carried in order to comply. The application would be carried until September 12, 2019, starting at 7:00 p.m.

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 August 1, 2019, consisting of ten (10) 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 November 7, 2019.

Josette C. Kratz, Secretary

/jck