

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

**MINUTES APRIL 21, 2016
APPROVED ON MAY 5, 2016**

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 April 21, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Allan Kehrt, Chairman of the Cranbury Township Planning Board, called the meeting to order and acted as the Chairman thereof.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Pursuant with the Sunshine Law, adequate notice in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act was provided of this meeting's date, time, place and agenda was mailed to the news media, posted on the Township bulletin board, mailed to those requesting personal notice, and filed with the Municipal Clerk.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

- Karen Callahan
- James Gallagher
- Susan Goetz
- Thomas Harvey
- Arthur Hasselbach
- Glenn Johnson
- Brian Schilling
- Jason Stewart
- Allan Kehrt

PROFESSIONALS IN ATTENDANCE

- Andrew Feranda, Traffic Consultant
- David Hoder, Board Engineer
- Trishka Cecil, Esquire, Board Attorney
- Josette C. Kratz, Secretary
- Richard Preiss, Township Planner (Elizabeth Lehany in substitute for Mr. Preiss)

Virginia Guinta, Court Reporter

RESOLUTIONS

**PB269-15 Molto Bene, LLC (formally known as The Blue Rooster Restaurant)
Block 23, Lot 109, Zone VC
17 North Main Street
Amended Site Plan for an exception/waiver
to allow additional seating without onsite parking**

MOTION MADE: Mr. Harvey
MOTION SECONDED: Mr. Schilling

VOTE ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Harvey, Mr. Schilling, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Kehrt
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: Ms. Callahan, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Hasselbach, and Mr. Johnson (ineligible)
ABSENT: Ms. Goetz

MOTION CARRIED

MINUTES

Upon a motion and second the minutes for September 24, 2015; and

November 19, 2015 - with a change at the end of a statement attributed to Mr. Schilling concerning the emergency access drive shall be 18-ft width added to Condition #5, his primary point was to add to the resolution language omitted regarding the Township Committee to establish an emergency access easement at the terminus of the Ryan Road cul-de-sac and ask to strike the 18-ft wide from the condition; and

February 4, 2016 all were passed unanimously.

APPLICATIONS

**PB277-15 Cranbury Sixty, LLC & One Continental, LLC
Block 5, Lot 2.04 & 2.07, Zone LI
280 & 286 Prospect Plains Road
Preliminary and Final Site Plan and Subdivision with Variances**

REPRESENTATIVES: Christopher DeGrezia, Attorney for the Applicant
Steven Spinweber, Sudler – Applicant
Alfred Coco, PE – Professional Engineer for Applicant
John Rea, PE – Traffic Consultant

Mr. Harvey excused himself from the applicant since he had not listened to the recording of the previous meeting.

Mr. DeGrezia stated tonight was a continuation from their previous hearing on March 3, 2016. He gave the overview of where the application ended at the last hearing. This would be a warehouse development on the corner of South River Road and Prospect Plains Road. Currently, there were two very large lots: one with 500,000 +/- SF office and the other an existing Ford warehouse. This approval would readjust lot lines to create three fully conforming lots; smallest lot would be 31 acres. Each lot would have a separate warehouse. There would be two new warehouses and then the existing Ford warehouse, which would remain untouched. At the last hearing, they completed their testimony. However, the Board had some suggestions and questions at the last hearing; they (the applicant and the applicant's professionals) will address those concerns to discuss tonight.

Mr. Kehrt announced the Board's engineer was unavailable for this meeting (planned for a long time vacation); however, he seemed comfortable if the applicant was agreeing with all the conditions.

Mr. Coco, still under oath, stated the changes made since the last hearing. Based on Mr. Hoder's most recent report, there are still issues the applicant needs to address, but there have been communication between him and Mr. Hoder and there are trying to comply with the rest of his letter as well.

Mr. Stewart asked where the Board's alternative engineer was.

Mr. Kehrt said he had a long conversation with Mr. Hoder.

Mr. Coco said they had not done a complete analysis of the existing basin, but he asked us to do additional work.

Mr. Coco, referring to Exhibit A-1, they stated the basin in question was in the northwest corner and since they were not doing anything to that basin, they did refer to it in the original report. Mr. Hoder had asked and wanted to confirm they were meeting the regulatory reductions for peak flow. They amended the report Mr. Hoder was satisfied. The other items remaining are detail changes, which the applicant has previously agreed to.

Mr. Stewart asked Mr. Coco if he was testifying the applicant was accepting all the items of the report. Mr. Coco responded yes.

Mr. Kehrt asked Mr. Feranda if there were any items brought up in his conversation with Mr. Hoder.

Mr. Feranda said his letter covered all the remaining items and he had been in discussion and had no outstanding major issues except his letter.

Mr. Coco said there was an issue with them reusing the existing parking area to the south of the entrance driveway off Cranbury South River Road. They have identified it on the new plan; it would be either trailer storage or truck staging area. The Board had an issue with that so they reviewed the conditions of the landscape in the field with the professionals. Based on that field review, they made revisions.

EXHIBIT A-5 Revised, color site plan with landscape changes

Mr. Coco said the basin has not changed but the landscape around the basin and parking area has been changed. They have reduced some of the pavement. There was a question about that and the municipal riparian zone next to it so the question arose on keeping it there. The applicant agreed to remove the pavement back about 150-ft and replant with turf and plant material. They also pulled the pavement away from Cranbury South River Road about 20-ft to allow more area to landscape. There would remain 79 parking spaces until the applicant finds a good use for them; attached to the warehouse use. The other item, which came up during the field trip, was the questionable trees identified and annotated to be removed and replaced with new plant material. They are reducing the impervious coverage by 0.7% by removing that pavement. They agreed to the remaining issues in Mr. Preiss's report; page 2, middle of page, both recommendations.

Mr. DeGrazia said they have complied with everything in both the engineer and planner's reports.

Mr. Rae, still under oath, mentioned an item in Mr. Hoder's report concerning a statement of the pro-rata share for off tract improvement, referring the Liberty Bridge. Mr. Rae stated he did not feel this site would utilize that bridge.

EXHIBIT A-6 Arial photo of local road network.

Mr. Rae stated the property is located at the southeast corner of Prospect Plains Road and Cranbury South River Road. The bridge in question would connect Liberty Way, which serves a few buildings, crosses Half Acre Road, and deadens. There is a southern section of Liberty Way, but discontinues. He does see any of their traffic using this road considering

Their access to Cranbury South River Road is only a right in - right out only. The road would only get the traffic down to Half Acre Road where they could go east, but he felt any traffic that has an origin or destination to the east could go right onto Prospect Plains Road and work their way into Monroe to get where they need to go. There really was no need to use the section of Liberty Way.

Mr. Stewart asked about the congestion on Route 130. (Mr. Orlando said it still would not be, he did think anyone would know where it is.)

Mr. Stewart referred to the extension on the southerly section of Liberty Road. He asked if there was a congested situation where people travel north, would they not divert onto Liberty Way to avoid the traffic.

Mr. Orlando said in theory anything would be possible, but still could not see anyone wanting to use that section of Liberty Way.

Mr. Feranda referred to the traffic report; stating in the AM there would be about 15 trips from the south and in the PM about 32 trips with about the same returning. Some of those trips may use Liberty Way and some may use Route 130 (peak hour). Most of the truck traffic would likely to head toward Exit 8A. He agreed that it would not be a significant number.

Mr. Hasselbach concurred.

Mr. Rea said they wanted to address the comment since it was mentioned in Mr. Hoder's review memo.

Mr. Kehrt felt Mr. Hoder brought it up as a subject that should be discussed; since it had been asked before.

Mr. Rea felt they could address the outstanding comments made in Mr. Fernanda's letter.

Mr. Kehrt asked if the discussion could go back to the memo written for the last hearing.

Mr. Feranda said the revised set of plans show some of the items requested in the letter, however, not all of them. Most of what is left is clean-up items, and the applicant has agreed to that. He asked if there were any the applicant felt needing additional discussion.

Ms. Cecil asked to clarify the term "most" or "some" with regard to the report; are there some comments that could not be addressed?

Mr. DeGrezia said the purpose of the resubmission was not to address all of the comments and reports at this time. The purpose was to address the large concerns that the board had about the landscaping and parking in that one corner. They still have to go through and make all the revisions as they have agreed to. These submissions address only the issues that the Board asked them to look at and make changes to.

Mr. Kehrt commented he wanted to clarify there was an additional report.

Mr. Rea said he spoke with Mr. Feranda and Mr. Coco, the site engineer and all of the items in Mr. Fernanda's report: striping, handicap-parking signage, would be complied too. Mr. Feranda added guide rail and grading.

Mr. Rea said they would make the County application and have agreed they would submit their traffic study to the County Planning Board and ask them to review the traffic signal timing at Prospect Plains

Road and Cranbury South River Road to see if they could increase the green time for the southbound left turn. He felt this could be addressed by adding a few seconds of “green time” south bound and would make the request to the County.

Mr. Rea discussed the acceleration/deceleration lane, which will take place in the right lane and the through-traffic will pass vehicles in the left lane. They have an application in front of the County since ultimately it is their road.

Mr. Feranda stated, knowing the topography and the farmhouse (historical site) and the two utility poles, he was satisfied they have at least one lane for slower vehicles.

Mr. Kehrt mentioned the area marked on the plan for office areas and, when the tenant wants, he will come back to the Planning Board and explain to the Board. Mr. DeGrazia said they would comply to the 60-ft setback with exception some of the office because the size of the office they may not be able to rotate them that far away. In the case of less than 60-FT they would provide a plan which showed screening or such small equipment units that you will not see them.

Ms. Leheny, sworn, stated landscaped was satisfactory, however, the ornamental grass species should be changed in the site triangle.

Mr. Hasselbach asked about the subdivision. Mr. Coco said it would be three lots, one each for each building, however the third would be the existing Ford Building. Mr. Hasselbach mentioned cross access easements. Mr. Coco said they had agreed to easements.

Mr. Kehrt opened the floor to the public; however, there were none present.

Mr. Stewart moved the Board approve the plan subject to them accepting all the comments from the professionals’ reports and recommendations and with the addition of the waiver, acknowledges no acceleration/deceleration lane. That the Board feels comfortable allowing that due to the existence of the two lanes in the direction, and other existing conditions.

Ms. Cecil asked if it is also subject to the conditions agreed to in the record at the last hearing, along with waivers, exceptions and variances.

Mr. DeGrazia said they agreed.

Mr. Hasselbach seconded the motion.

MOTION MADE: Mr. Stewart
MOTION SECONDED: Mr. Hasselbach

VOTE ROLL CALL

AYES: Ms. Callahan, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Hasselbach, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Schilling, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Kehrt
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED

MINUTES

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 hereby certify;

That I am duly elected and acting secretary of the Cranbury Township Planning Board and, that the foregoing minutes of the Planning Board, held on March 17, 2016 consisting of 4 pages, constitute a true and correct copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name of said Planning Board this May 5, 2016.

Josette C. Kratz, Secretary

/jck