

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

**JUNE 1, 2022 MINUTES  
APPROVED JUNE 29, 2022**

**TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING**

The regular meeting of the Cranbury Township Zoning Board of Adjustment was held via Zoom <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89352721724> Webinar ID: 893 5272 1724 on June 1, 2022, at 7:00 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Meacock, ZBA Chairperson, called the meeting to order and presided over the meeting.

**STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE**

Adequate notice as well as electronic notice of this meeting was 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**

- ☐ Joseph Buonavolonta
- ☒ Robert Diamond
- ☐ John Hoffman
- ☒ Richard Kallan

- ☒ David Nissen
- ☒ Steven Schwarz
- ☒ Frank McGovern (Alternate #1)
- ☒ Saras Kothari (Alternate #2)
- ☒ Merilee Meacock

### **PROFESSIONALS IN ATTENDANCE**

- ☒ Robert Davidow, Zoning Board of Adjustment Attorney
- ☒ Robin Tillou, Secretary
- ☒ David Hoder, Engineer
- ☒ Elizabeth Leheny, Planner
- ☒ Andrew Feranda, Traffic Consultant

### **MINUTES**

Upon a motion made and seconded the minutes for May 4, 2022 were unanimously approved by those members eligible to vote on said dates.

### **APPLICATION**

**ZBA305-17 Mobin Management,  
Block 18.07, Lot 44 & 45, Zone GC,  
112 South Main Street,  
Ext of Time for Previous Approval of Use Variance, Preliminary and Final  
Site Plan with Bulk Variances**

REPRESENTATIVE: Mr. Gary Forshner, Esq., Law Offices of Gary S. Forshner

Mr. Robert Davidow, Board Attorney, announced the applicant was granted a one-year extension last year for the approvals and are here tonight for a further extension.

Mr. Robert Diamond, Zoning Board Member, recused himself from this application due to conflict of interest.

Mr. Forshner introduced the application by stating the property has an odd shape and is located on Rt. 130 and South Main Street. The Zoning Board had approved the application for residential over commercial on the first floor. That was approved a little before COVID hit and COVID has impacted the project as well as outside agencies holding up the project. The application is close to getting everything done. There are a few comments from the Construction Official due to conflict in Plainsboro and the application is waiting for a final review and sign off by the Middlesex County Planning Board. One caveat is since the application was filed there were discrepancies in the survey. The application will be filed for an amended approval to clean

up the survey due to setbacks being different. That has nothing to do with this evening's approval, the applicant wanted to advise the Board of this. What is being sought tonight is the approval of a one-year extension until May 1, 2023 which is the second extension of the three permitted by the MLUL.

Mr. Kallan asked how many extensions are permitted.

Mr. Forshner stated after the two years from approval there are three extensions permitted (one-year each extension).

Mr. Kallan motioned to approve the one-year extension. Mr. Kothari seconded the motion.

#### ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Kallan, Mr. Kothari, Mr. Schwarz and Ms. Meacock

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

#### MOTION APPROVED

**ZB354-22      Woodmont Industrial Partners, LLC  
Block 7, Lot(s) 1 & 2, Zone HC  
2678 Route 130 (Lot 1) – 376 Half Acre Road (Lot 2)  
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan  
d(1) Use Variance**

REPRESENTATIVE:      Mr. Richard Hoff, Esq., Bisgaier Hoff, LLC  
                                 Mr. Steven Santola, Woodmont Properties  
                                 Mr. William Lane, Menlo Engineering  
                                 Mr. John McDonough, P.P.,  
                                 Mr. Alan Lothian, Traffic Engineer

#### EXHIBITS:

**A-1 – Woodmont Industrial – Recent Developments**

**A-2 - Existing Conditions, 6/1/2022**

**A-3 – Overall Plan Exhibit**

**A-4 – 1995 Aerial View of Prologis Property**

**A-5 – 2002 Aerial View of Prologis Property**

**A-6 – 5/31/2022 Existing Condition Photo of Stormwater Pond**

**A-7 – Color Rendering Option #1 – 2678 U.S. 130 & Half Acre Road Perspective View**

**A-8 – Color Rendering Option #2 - 2678 U.S. 130 & Half Acre Road Perspective View**

**A-9 – Aerial Drone View of Subject Site Looking South/East/North/West – 2/1/22**

Mr. Davidow announced the notice is sufficient and the Zoning Board can take jurisdiction over this application.

Mr. Hoff introduced the application by stating they are seeking a d(1), height and bulk variances. The Board Planner's report on page three goes in detail of all the variances being requested. The proposal is a 116,000 sq. ft. warehouse in the HC zone that does not allow warehouses as a permitted use.

Mr. Davidow swore in the Board professionals.

Mr. Steven Santola, Executive Vice President of General Council of Woodmont Properties, was sworn in by Mr. Davidow.

Mr. Santola stated Woodmont Properties has been in existence since 1933. Woodmont has been building residential properties for 50 years. Woodmont has purchased and built over the past 3 years over 8 million sq. ft. from Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. 75 – 80% of the work done was in New Jersey.

Exhibit A-1 was displayed, and Mr. Santola went over what each example warehouse property was for that Woodmont has built.

Mr. William Lane, Menlo Engineering, Applicant's Engineer, was sworn in by Mr. Davidow.

Mr. Lane advised the Board he has been with Menlo Engineering for 37 years and licensed in NJ for 25 years and his license is current. He has worked on several projects with Woodmont for years and has testified before 90 – 100 Boards in NJ and had graduated from NJ State of Technology.

Chair Meacock accepted Mr. Lane's credentials.

Exhibit A-2 – Existing Conditions, 6/1/2022 was displayed.

Mr. Lane stated the site is 8.89 acres and Route 130 is to the west, Half Ace Road to the north and Prologis warehouse is to the east and the newly constructed Penske facility is to the west. It exists today as an 8,300 sq. ft. commercial property piece with 100 parking spaces with the liquor store existing. There is an existing single-family house along the property along Half Acre Road. It is wooded in the remainder of the site.

Exhibit A-3 – Overall Conditions, 6/1/2022 was displayed.

Mr. Lane stated this is the 116,000 sq. ft. proposed warehouse 500 feet long, 232 feet wide. There is an office in the northwest corner that is 2,917 sq. ft. The site is proposing 130 ft. wide driveway off Half Acre Road which will lead to the 34 loading spaces. There is one driving ramp in the building. There is ten (10) trailer storage spaces and one masonry enclosed dumpster enclosure. The loading spaces will be 12 ft. wide. Off the driveway they have a 60-space parking lot where they have three handicap spaces and two electrical vehicle spaces and 24 ft. wide drive aisle 9 x 18 spaces. The applicant is proposing two monument signs. One on each side of the entry driveway, they are 5 ft. wide and 10 ft. high. They are proposing a sidewalk along the Half Acre Road frontage. The stormwater will be two small scale retention basins which would treat the runoff in the parking lot and the loading area. Additionally, they have one large scale infiltration basin which will take care of the runoff. With the stormwater management they will try and minimize impervious surfaces where they wanted minimum size driveway width and narrow the loading spaces. The drainage pattern goes to the south and off to the east. They will maintain the existing trees on the southeast corner of the property along Route 130. They are proposing native plantings along the site. They are providing the new echo catch basin heads to prevent anything going into the stormwater system. The stormwater pond on the Prologis property does not have a riparian along the edge due to being a stormwater feature.

Exhibit A-5 – 1995 Aerial View and Exhibit A-6 – 2002 Aerial View was displayed.

Mr. Lane stated the aerial photos show that the pond is part of the stormwater management feature.

Exhibit A-6 – Existing Condition Photo of Stormwater Pond was displayed.

Mr. Lane stated they are proposing an eight-inch main extension for sanitary off the northwest corner of the property. From the edge of the property, 650 ft. down is an existing manhole that they are proposing to be tied into the sanitary sewer. The existing flow off the property is approximately 1,130 gallons per day-based on 300 gallons from the existing single-family house. And 830 gallons from the commercial property. The proposed warehouse facility will be approximately 1,250 gallons. The increase is minimal. A connection is being proposed for water into the existing main that is along the northerly side of Half Acre Road. A hotbox is being proposed at the northeast end of the building. They will have to work with the water company for a location, but that is their desired location. There may be a potential for a variance if the water company deems, they must have it closer for a structure in the front yard setback. That is something we are asking for the Board to approve as part of the conditions.

Mr. Lane advised of the landscaping stating they will have 247 trees overall, 252 shrubs throughout the site and there is a significant buffer throughout Route 130 where they are

proposing 79 trees which is a mixture of Evergreens and Deciduous along with 103 shrubs. There is a berm which is approximately 2 – 3 ft. high above the road along Route 130. Along Half Acre Road they are proposing a berm that is 1 – 2 ft. high and 64 trees with a mixture of Evergreens and Deciduous and 103 shrubs. Reserving approximately a quarter of an acre of existing trees in the southwest corner along Route 130. The landscape designer has been in touch with the Shade Tree Commission, and they are willing to work with what they would recommend. The plan for linear development and trees is complying with the ordinance. If they would like different species, they will work with the Shade Tree Commission. The fire official had requested the trees in the parking lot be removed. If the Board prefers the trees, they can do that. If they do go with the fire officials request, they would have to request a waiver for those trees.

Mr. Lane advised of the proposed lighting stating that it will be five LED building mounted lights. There are another ten light poles around the building that are LED. It is approximately 24 ½ - 25 ft. high. The design waivers are: the parking configuration is required to be perpendicular with the street and they are off by four degrees; the parking access should be off the highest traffic street which would be Route 130 and we are requesting it to be off of Half Acre Road; the loading width required is 15 ft. and they are requesting 12 ft. wide; the bay of parking is allowed on the front yard and the highest traffic street which is Route 130 and they are proposing Half Acre Road; the maximum building setback from a right-of-way is 90 ft. and they are proposing 95.5 ft. down to 110.1 ft; the ordinance states they have to have binds and plants on large expansive walls and they are not proposing any of that; the design waiver could be, as mentioned, for the trees the fire official requested to remove. The variances being requested are: front yard setback requirement is 100, they are proposing 110.1 ft.; the maximum building height requirement is 24 ft. for one story and they are proposing 41 ft.; the maximum requirement for monument signs is one and the applicant is proposing two on each side of the driveway entrance; the use variance d(1) due to the use not being permitted in the HC zone; the building wall sign area requirement is a maximum of 50 sq. ft. and they are proposing 66 sq. ft.; the building height maximum requirement is 35 ft. from where the signage falls out of the building and they are looking for the address sign area where 2 sq. ft. is required and they are proposing 6.8 – 7 sq. ft. or if they go by the fire official it may increase to 9 – 10 sq. ft.

Chair Meacock requested an explanation of the height variance.

Mr. Hoff stated the maximum height in the HC zone are 24 ft. for one story or three stories or 35 ft. for mixed use whichever is less. The proposal is for 41 ft. so if there was a mixed use, we would require a variance for an additional 6 and if it were a single retail, it would be a difference between 24 and 41 ft.

Chair Meacock opened the meeting to the public for the engineer portion of the testimony only.

Lorraine Morris, 96 Halsey Reed Road, Cranbury, NJ, asked about the truck bays and if they cut down the number of truck bays for the size or they were looking to get more truck bays in.

Mr. Lane stated 12 ft. is the industry standard, but the town ordinance requires 15 ft.

Mr. Hoder, Board Engineer, asked that the applicant do testimony on the riparian zone, he is now satisfied that that is a retention basin, and the buffer is not needed.

Roberto Martinez, Applicant's Architect, was sworn in by Mr. Davidow.

Mr. Martinez stated he went to school abroad and finished his studies at NJIT and has been working in architecture for 20 years. He has been licensed for 10 years in NJ and his license is current.

Chair Meacock accepted Mr. Martinez's credentials.

Mr. Martinez stated the building is a precast made of concrete panels. The same as the buildings located down Half Acre Road. The height of the building is 40 ft. They are creating a double height look in the corner which looks like an office building in passing. They are using shades of white or grey for the color and that can be changed depending on the Board's preference. The safety of the building is compliant with the latest codes.

Mr. Hoff asked if the loading dock areas are now standard to be 12 ft.

Mr. Martinez stated he has had experience with approximately 40 of these buildings and it is standard for 12'. He has not done a 15 ft. bay building in years.

Mr. Martinez stated he will be creating internal roof drains so there will be slopes toward the center at multiple slopes. Most of the equipment will be at the center of the building. The corner will need extra HVAC equipment, but it will be difficult to see at eye level, you can only see it from the aerial view.

Exhibit A-8 – Color Rendering Option #2 was displayed and explained this is another option of a look with brick incorporated.

Mr. Kothari asked why they need the 40 ft. height.

Mr. Martinez stated that is the nature of the industry and is typical. The average is 45 ft. due to the racking system for storage. Most tenants are asking for that height.

Ms. Leheny asked where the second wall sign is.

Mr. Martinez stated it is along Route 130.

Ms. Leheny asked where the second number sign is.

Mr. Martinez stated it is at the corner of the brick along Route 130.

Mr. John McDonough, Applicant's Planner, was sworn in by Mr. Davidow.

Mr. McDonough stated he is licensed in NJ in Professional Planning and received his education in Rutgers and is a member of A.I.C.P. His license is current and in good standing and has testified in Cranbury previously.

Chair Meacock accepted his credentials.

Mr. McDonough stated the 2019 Master Plan reexamination sites the number one problem and objective is the revitalization of Route 130 Corridor is needed and this property is on the Route 130 Corridor.

Exhibit A-9 – Aerial Drone View of Subject Site Looking South/East/North/West – 2/1/22 was displayed.

Mr. McDonough explained its current condition is not contributing to the economic intent of the HC Zone in which the site is located. The site backs up to the LI Zone and there are industrial uses all around the property. This is a use that is gaining currency. This warehouse will keep storage of materials, medicines and goods that are essential to the public welfare. This lot meets the LI requirements. The size, the location in the main corridor has connectivity there and keeps off residential neighborhoods. This is a use that serves the public welfare by delivering goods and medicines to the public. No retail has manifested at this location. This use would not compete with the Village center as in the Master Plan and will not compete with retail. It will not create adverse impacts and will not be an invasion or an intrusion from its nature.

Mr. McDonough stated the building height is 41 ft. versus the maximum permitted in the zone of 24 ft. This height meets industry standards with the clear spans that are necessary today to provide operational efficiencies. It is appropriate for today's modern warehouse. The benefit of the d(6) relief is none of the purposes of height control under the process standard would be violated. The added height will not create negative shadow effects, block scenic views and not going to create over intensity of development or excessive population. The height is necessary to effectuate a beneficial use. The front yard depth of 110 ft. which is exceeding the requirement of 100 ft., is based on a rectangular building on a non-rectangular lot. The 10 ft. disparity will not be perceivable to the public's eye. There are lower-level design exceptions addressed by Mr. Lane



that are listed well in Ms. Leheny's report. The appeal of the use variance is it is site specific and not zone general. This site, he feels, is framed by industrial.

Mr. Kallan stated the ordinance states "the purpose of this district is to provide along the Route 130 corridor close to the Village Hamlet area larger retail stores providing goods and services that are unlikely or inappropriate to locate in the Village commercial district in downtown Cranbury and smaller, less regionally oriented uses provided for in the general commercial GC district." The HC district was selected to be centered for one of these access roads closest to the Village center, this was done deliberately. Why should we ignore what the ordinance says?

Mr. Huff stated Boards like this exist to grant relief and it does not mean it is dispositive with whether the application is entitled to a use variance.

Ms. Leheny stated the standard is a Zoning Board can grant a deviation from a permitted use if a site is particularly suitable, if it has characteristics that make it suitable for a use that is not currently permitted. The idea is it would only apply to this specific property. Each case rises and falls on its own merits. If any property would like approval due to other properties approval, they must have the same characteristics as the piece of property. The Master Plan states Route 130 would have larger retail uses if they did not detract from the viability of the businesses on Main Street in the Cranbury Village. There were zoning changes made post 2010 to the HC zone for permitted uses to try to spur development. The 2019 reexamination does discuss that there were successes with Dunkin Donuts, Penske and 7-11. You must decide tonight whether this site is suited for the use the applicant is seeking.

Mr. Diamond asked why this site when there are vacant sites in LI Zones.

Mr. McDonough stated the focus is on this site and there is law that states being located on the edge of a zone where the use is allowed is another basis to grant a use variance application. Testimony was just made that it will flow and function safely. This is a site that has 4 times plus the size of a typical HC zone.

Mr. McGovern asked if there was a cross easement agreement to use the pond that was shown.

Mr. Huff stated our stormwater is not dependent on the use of their stormwater structure. Mr. Lane agreed.

Mr. McGovern stated it shows there will be a remaining residential home just over the northeast property line, is there a plan regarding that?

Mr. Lane stated the existing residential home will be removed.

Mr. McGovern asked about the other residential homes not on the property.

Mr. Lane stated there are no plans to do anything with those residential homes.

Mr. McGovern stated regarding the brick face option and the original gray and white façade, he stated he preferred the original gray and white façade.

Mr. Kothari stated his concerns are the left turn from Route 130 south of the property and the residential homes there.

Mr. Kallan stated originally there was no proposed berm along Route 130, now there is a 2 ft. berm. Suddenly there will be a wall approximately 20,000 sq. ft., 500 ft. by 40 ft. There should be a 10 – 15 ft. berm so when you plant trees the building is hidden from Route 130.

Mr. Huff stated the berm came from input of the DRC meeting. The berm will not hide the building when driving by.

Mr. Lane stated the building will be 100 ft. away from the road, so the berm will be put on the road with landscaping surrounding it. You will not see anything other than the upper portion of the building from perspective of the road. You still do get good screening even though it is not as tall as the building.

Mr. Kallan stated he is taking the perspective of heading south on Route 130.

Mr. Kothari asked if the surrounding warehouses have a 40 ft. height.

Mr. McDonough stated it is the standard industry height.

Mr. Nissen stated he is not willing to deny a tax paying use that brings people to the area with no evidence that there will be competition for commercial uses that this will preclude.

Mr. Schwarz asked if this were an LI zone, would the building be the same setback and size.

Mr. McDonough stated this site and development would follow the LI requirements.

Chair Meacock opened the meeting to the public.

Janice Mondoker, 92 Halsey Reed Road, Cranbury, NJ, asked if this will be a storage warehouse or a 24/7 logistics facility and would they consider completing Liberty Way. She does not believe there will be no emergency calls due to the facilities getting plenty of calls.

Steven McMaster, 64 Maplewood Avenue, Cranbury, NJ, stated this building is not well suited. There is a ban on tractor trailers across the street from where this will be. The left turn from Route 130 south bound is a concern. Wildlife displacement is also a concern. Projections of the effects to the stormwater is a concern. The volume of drain water should be considered as part of the variance discussion. Is this use inherently beneficial? Is it beneficial to an admirably successful property developer or is it beneficial to the residents?

Mr. Alan Lothian, Applicant's Traffic Engineer, was sworn in by Mr. Davidow.

Mr. Lothian stated his education is from Rutgers and NJIT. He is a licensed professional engineer in NJ and he has testified before dozens of Boards throughout the State for traffic engineering and his license remains current.

Chair Meacock accepted Mr. Lothian's credentials.

Mr. Lothian stated the site as it exists as a liquor store is generating approximately 16 trips in the morning. The proposed warehouse projected at the peak hours (the highest anticipated in the morning) is 41 trips, so that is a net increase of 25 trips which is less than 1 trip every two minutes on average total. In every direction is much less than that on average. A total of 7 truck trips during that time, two entering and five exiting. In the PM, the liquor store generates 110 trips in the peak hour between 4:30 – 5:30. The proposed warehouse PM peak hour will be 38 total trips with 7 truck trips, 4 entering and 3 exiting. That is a net decrease of 72 trips. If this was proposed as a retail center of 116,000 sq. ft., then you would be looking at hundreds of additional trips both in the AM and PM peak hours. It is a low to moderate trip generator compared to what could be in the HC zone. Maplewood Avenue serves as a near side jug handle for Half Acre Road and it is identified as a truck route which is there today and functioning. We are looking to restripe Half Acre Road in front of the driveway to provide a left turn treatment because there is 50 ft. cartway width and we will work with Mr. Feranda, Board Traffic Engineer, to make that left turn more attractive. We are trying to limit the trucks that would come down South River Road, Route 130 and use that near side jug handle using Maplewood Avenue. Most of the traffic will leave by making a left out of Half Acre Road, make a right to get onto Route 130 or go up South River Road.

Exhibit A-3 was displayed.

Mr. Lothian stated they are eliminating the conflict point on Route 130 by eliminating the existing driveway on Route 130 taking everything on Half Acre Road. There is no concern using Half Acre Road. The internal circulation is designed to accommodate all the design vehicles (passenger cars, tractor trailers, refuse trucks and emergency vehicles).

Mr. Diamond stated comparing number of trips of the liquor store and/or retail where the vast majority will be vehicles. Tractor trailers are typically 70 – 80 ft. long and as a resident the jug handle is a problem at a certain number of hours and it will make things worse than it already is. There must be a way of comparing tractor trailer trips to vehicle trips due to behaving differently.

Mr. Lothian stated if you are reducing 72 trips it does not equate to reducing the number that much. We are still not hitting significant thresholds of impacts due to the size of the warehouse. If the warehouse was much larger it may have an impact.

Mr. Kothari asked if the applicant was doing the analysis for the liquor store for Route 130 or both driveways.

Mr. Lothian stated they took analysis from both driveways. This will not make the trips go down if you eliminate analysis from one driveway.

Mr. Kallan asked why 7:30 am – 8:30 am analysis was done for a liquor store when they are not open yet.

Mr. Lothian stated that was an analysis for deliveries made at that time.

Mr. Schwarz asked if the analysis for the warehouse was done comparing warehouses with the same number of docks and of having a 41 ft. facility.

Mr. Lothian stated the trip generation is based on similar warehousing facility which includes similar dock doors and height of the building.

Mr. Feranda stated the trip generation is accurate. The weekend trip was not generated due to warehouses not contributing due to low operation at that time. Information should be provided regarding that due to warehouses being low at that time.

Mr. Lothian stated the Saturday peak typically will be right in the middle of the day and a liquor store would be significantly higher than for the warehouse.

Mr. Feranda asked if the trip generation is consistent with the parking spaces provided (60 spaces). Is there shift work where one comes in and one comes out?

Mr. Lothian stated there is shift work and a bit of an overlap in the shifts.

Mr. Feranda stated 7 trucks in the am and 7 trucks in the pm which is approximately 20% of the total traffic would be expected to be the truck traffic. Peak period traffic will be the daily traffic, so roughly 70 – 75 daily truck trips from this site, is that consistent with the loading bays?

Mr. Lothian stated the truck generation is based on the ITE and on the highest peak hour for the warehouse during the day. The trip generation for daily trips is 70 trucks which is turning over the loading docks approximately once a day.

Mr. Feranda asked what the path is from exit 8A of the NJ Turnpike.

Mr. Lothian stated the direct route for trucks/passenger cars would be South River Road, turn onto Liberty Way, come down to Half Acre Road, make a right and turn left into the site. When exiting they would make a left, make a direct right onto Route 130.

Mr. Feranda stated using the two trips times ten might be 10 – 20 trucks that may have that as their route. Would a left turn with a truck out of the site across Half Acre Road would be an appropriate movement at that location?

Mr. Lothian stated yes with the shift of the driveway further away from the intersection it gives that much more distance and allows for more stacking of vehicles at the intersection to make that movement more efficient.

Mr. Feranda stated there are several single-family houses along Half Acre Road to the east of the site. Do you know the distance of the driveway is from the property line to the next home?

Mr. Lothian stated approximately 110 ft.

Mr. Feranda stated there are five single family homes with one being removed which will make it four. How is the traffic for those four homes that are remaining going to function with the warehouse on one side and the Prologis on the other side, would they be able to turn in and turn out of their driveways safely?

Mr. Lothian stated the left turn treatment along that section of Half Acre Road whether it be a two way left turn lane to allow for those residents and businesses to make those left turns easier into and out of their site. We are amenable to working with Mr. Feranda on that.

Mr. Feranda stated as a condition the striping will be done and it will allow for those homes to get out of traffic and be in a protected area so they can make their left turns. The loading docks do face those houses, what would be the noise impact on these four homes remaining?

Mr. Lothian stated he can not speak on the acoustics; he can speak on the traffic.

Exhibit A-2 was displayed.

Mr. Lane stated regarding the stormwater we have two small scale infiltration basins, one that takes the load from the parking lot and the second takes the loading area drainage off the eastern property line. There is another basin that takes the roof stormwater. With all three combined there are 53,000 cubic feet of storage area. There is the outlet that discharges out toward the pond. The typical flow goes to the south and bends around towards the east and goes towards the pond. For the 100 year there is 34% reduction flow in the peak and down to 2-year storm they have 62% reduction in peak to give a perspective on the volume of these if they were combined if you 100 x 100 ft. hole it would be 5 ft. tall. These calculations are dictated by applicable DEP standards.

Mr. Hoder stated the Board may be more comfortable with a submission the flow passing the property line and creating a different situation that what is existing now.

Mr. Huff stated that can be a part of the condition that they are not triggering any stormwater prohibition.

Mr. Hoder referenced his report asking if the easements for the basins will be for the Township and if the applicant would agree to put crosswalks in the car parking area.

Mr. Huff stated yes to both.

Mr. Hoder stated Half Acre Road is filled with cracks and is in poor shape. Would the applicant be willing to overlay their frontage to the center line?

Mr. Huff stated as a condition if the Board were to grant approval yes.

Mr. Hoder asked if the lighting requests in his report can be managed between engineers.

Mr. Lane stated yes.

Mr. Hoder stated regarding the disposal of waste and the trash area is too small can you explain what the trash situation on site will be in the future.

Mr. Lane stated that would depend on the tenant. Whatever they need to do to manage their recycling and trash on the tenant would provide.

Mr. Hoder stated if they do not have a compactor do you think the disposal area of 15 x 20 is adequate for 116,000 sq. ft. building.

Mr. Lane stated yes, the other buildings they have done for Woodmont is the same size they used, and it has been working.

Mr. Hoder stated generally the mechanical equipment is located above the office building and not in the center of the building.

Mr. Martinez stated any equipment for that office will be pushed back minimum 15 – 20 ft. and from there you can bring down all the HVAC that you need. The office space is 3,000 sq. ft. so it will not be large equipment. The power pit is to create a proper flashing from roof to wall.

Mr. Hoder asked if there are any more comments in the landscaping plan that you would not like to do.

Mr. Lane stated he will work with the Shade Tree Commission on the type of plants and provide the foundation of plantings and get the right numbers.

Mr. Hoder asked if Mr. Lane would be willing to irrigate the berms as required. .

Mr. Lane stated yes.

Mr. Hoder would like an operations and maintenance manual.

Mr. Lane stated yes for the stormwater.

Mr. Hoder stated 150.61 k. regarding upsizing types one size up for anything under 30 inches in diameter.

Mr. Lane stated they can provide that.

Mr. Hoder asked to provide a traffic plan for house soil brought in or taken from the site due to it being substantial.

Mr. Lane stated it looks like it will be an import and he will collaborate with the applicant for a route and what the number will be.

Mr. Hoder stated to provide a community impact statement due to no waiver being requested.

They can provide that.

Mr. Hoder stated some type of a downstream analysis for stormwater to make sure we do not have the peaks of the basins coinciding is what he will need.

Mr. Feranda asked what the access would be for a retail center.

Mr. Lothian stated one right in right out driveway access to serve any retail so any exiting traffic would not be going directly onto Half Acre Road.

Mr. Feranda stated a 116,000 sq. ft. retail would have plenty of peak hour trips and you would concur that would require more than one driveway and one only on Half Acre Road would not be adequate for that type of traffic.

Mr. Lothian stated correct it would be 600 peak hour trips in the PM for that level of retail development.

Mr. Feranda asked what a retail site would have for delivery trucks.

Mr. Lothian stated approximately 10 trips per day.

Mr. Feranda suggested of a sidewalk along Route 130 in addition to Half Acre Road.

Mr. Lothian would not want to promote pedestrians in that area.

Mr. Huff stated regarding the sound for the docks near the four residential homes, they would be willing to demonstrate that sound would not be an issue if the Board would like.

Chair Meacock opened the meeting to the public.

Janice Mondoker, 92 Halsey Reed Road, would like to know if this will be a storage warehouse or a 24-hour distribution facility. If Woodmont would consider completing Liberty Way, this may be something Cranbury should listen to.

Mr. Omar Mobin, 51 Cranbury Neck Road, stated the light at Half Acre Road is quite busy and it is hard to navigate. The trucks make it quite weary sometimes. The Board should consider making the alternate route that was suggested.

Ms. Leheny stated what the Board must look at and consider with the d(1) variance is that this is intended for larger retail uses to take advantage of Route 130 while not compromising the Main Street area in Village Center. The Board has the right if they find this site is suitable for this particular use. There are certain circumstances for this particular use. This does not have to be the only use in Cranbury suited for this use and it does not have to be the only use that can exist



on this site. It must be suitable for the use. The other issues are the negative criteria for the impacts on the neighborhood. Will they have substantial negative impacts. The Medici reconciliation or the enhanced quality of proof. The court has said there is still an enhanced quality of proof to reconcile why can the Board allow this use when it is not permitted in the zone plan. The past two or three years have been different with COVID and how we live our lives now, that is change that can be considered. All the other variances fall under this umbrella of whether the Board feels this site is suitable for the proposed use.

Motion to table this application to the rescheduled meeting of June 29, 2022 made by Mr. Kallan. Mr. Nissen offered a second.

Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Diamond, Mr. Kallan, Mr. Nissen, Mr. Schwarz, Mr. Kothari,  
Mr. McGovern and Ms. Meacock

Nays: None

Abstain: None

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

#### **ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

There being no further business, Mr. Kallan made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Diamond seconded, 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 Zoning Board of Adjustment and, that the preceding minutes of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, held on June 1, 2022, consisting of seventeen pages, constitute a true and correct copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

IN WITNESS of which, I have hereunto subscribed my name of said Zoning Board of Adjustment this June 30, 2022.

Robin Tillou  
Robin Tillou, Secretary