

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

**MINUTES SEPTEMBER 15, 2016
APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 17, 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 September 15, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Allan Kehrt, of the Cranbury Township Planning Board, called the meeting to order.

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 (Linda Scott filled in for Ms. Kratz, due to illness)
- Richard Preiss, P.P. Conflict Planner

APPLICATION/CAPITAL REVIEW

**PB287-16 Cranbury Public Library
 Block 23, Lot 14.03, Zone RLD-1
 North Main Street
 Capital Review**

**REPRESENTATIVES: Bertram Bush, Esquire
 Marilynn G. Mullen, Director - Cranbury Public Library
 Mark Berkowsky, Cranbury Public Library
 Julia Algerio, Engineer - Maser Consulting**

Mr. Kehrt asked Ms. Cecil to explain the differences between a capital review verses a normal site plan review process.

Ms. Cecil explained the Board was proceeding pursuant M.L.U.L. 40:55D-31; this provision requires the expenditure of public funds (be it the County, BOE, Municipal, etc.) must refer the site plan to the Planning Board. The Planning Board, charged with acting in advisory capacity, must review the application and make recommendations in connection with the Master Plan. The Board was reviewing the library site plan in order to give feedback and recommendations; however, not approving or denying (only acting in an advisory capacity).

Mr. Bush, the attorney for applicant, gave their public notice, certification of service, and mailings to the Board attorney. Ms. Cecil announced everything was in order. Mr. Bush stated the property in question was located at Block 23, Lot 14.03, on a 14.19-acre open space lot owned by the Township. The applicant was the Cranbury Public Library and the property owner the Township of Cranbury.

Ms. Cecil swore the professionals (both for the Applicant and for the Planning Board).

Ms. Mullen, in the capacity of Director of the Cranbury Library, stated a need for the new library. She shared researched material she ran across in a 1906 article referring to the Library

Board members stating, “. . . and someday we will have a free-standing library”, of which she believed that time was now. Ms. Mullen stated the library has been a shared space since before she lived in Cranbury (she has lived here for over 25 years). Cranbury School needed a dedicated school library to provide secure access for the children and meet the educational needs of the students. The Township needed a freestanding library/community center with sufficient space to separate the age groups, a quiet study area, a technology center, and community meeting area. The building will be being funded through private donations. The Library Board sought Township Committee, the elementary school and Planning Board input at all phases of the planning and design process. The library was responsible for the architectural designs and drawings and Township would be responsible for the site plan, including the parking area.

Mr. Kehrt asked if the school was actually asking the library to vacate.

Ms. Mullen stated that at one point the Library was asked to close during times when school was in session and children were using the library. The library could only be open to the public during lunch hours and after school, closed otherwise during the early morning and middle of the day. The library felt that was unacceptable and no further action was taken to restrict hours. However, with the need for security cameras in the school and other children security measures, this now was the only place where the public and the students mix.

Ms. Callahan, a member of the BOE and a member of the Planning Board, stated the library was welcome to stay as long as necessary and was not being “kicked out.”

Mr. Berkowsky, credentials accepted, stated an overview of the product.

EXHIBIT A-1 Site Plan Rendering

Mr. Berkowsky explained the site location was directly north of the school, east of the CHA Senior Housing, west of the ball field and beyond that area were residential areas. They proposed to construct an approximately 11,600 SF of library and community center building area with 20 parking spaces. Development complies with all lot and building size requirements and no variances requested. There would be several waivers required.

EXHIBIT A-2 Building Elevations

Mr. Berkowsky stated the design was intended to be complementary to the historical context of Cranbury’s agricultural heritage. Exterior would be fiber cement clapboard siding and asphalt single roofs. The colors anticipated were barn red and grey siding and trim.

EXHIBIT A-3 Floor Plan

Mr. Berkowsky described the spaces as described on the floor plan; 2 entrances, 4,300 SF public community center space (two rooms allowing 36 person in the small meeting room and 54 person in the large meeting room) and 7,300 SF library space.

Mr. Berkowsky showed a 75-ft wide right-of-way for future road connections, which would also allow for pedestrian access understanding the school, did not want a physical connection. He added that the school implied children would walk to Main Street to Park Place, noting a safety concern with crossing the parking lot. Garbage waste would remain a use of the school's waste containers and carried out by the school custodial staff daily. A fire hydrant is located at the corner of Park Place and entrance of the CHA senior housing, about 75-FT from the building and meets the fire department's requirement of less than 200-FT. Mechanical equipment would be located on platforms inside the building above the hung ceiling, below the roofline. There would be several condensing units placed on the west side of the building, sufficiently screened by building and landscaping.

Ms. Callahan stated the reason the Library currently uses the school's dumpster is because they are a tenant of the school. If and when the Library is no longer a tenant, any arrangement would need to be discussed further as the garbage service is a cost to the school.

Mr. Stewart asked where the access for the mechanical equipment. Mr. Berkowsky stated there will be a pull-down stairs within the library.

Mr. Hoder asked for a maintenance plan for storm water.

Ms. Goetz asked if the school was okay with continuing to use the school's waste bins.

Mr. Stewart asked how they would get the trash to the receptacles with no sidewalk.

Ms. Mullen made a comment that the Township uses the dumpster, as well as the school and since the library would be part of the Township, the assumption was since their waste already was carried out in that manner it would continue. Ms. Mullen said it would have to be walked over across the grass.

Ms. Callahan noted the intention was not to encourage children to walk across the parking lot.

Mr. Hasselbach suggested adding a walkway with speed bumps in the existing school parking lot and he indicated the parents exiting drive dangerously, after they have dropped off their child. He stated issues concerning snow removal and speed bumps, but there was a need to make drivers aware of the pedestrian crossing.

Mr. Feranda suggested no speed bumps, however textured walking areas. Mr. Preiss felt there

were ways to modify the parking lot to make it safer for children to cross.

Mr. Berkowsky stated there were 20 parking spaces to be provided which he felt was more than adequate to handle the library parking as there will be only two or three library staff members. The current library has eight dedicated parking spaces. If more spaces are eventually necessary, there are parking spaces on both sides of Park Place. Also, there could be a future parking space expansion to the western side, if needed. The building is not required to have a fire sprinkle system installed and landscape plan was designed to allow fire access to the building. Knox box would be placed at the main entrance to the library. Signage would be provided; however, he felt the fire department would know where the library was located. They would implement some paving or stabilized base along the side of the building.

Mr. Hasselbach asked about the construction. Mr. Berkowsky said the construction would be steel framed. The main library would have wood trusses (four large exposed from the interior as an architectural element). Mr. Berkowsky stated the building should be energy efficient.

Mr. Stewart asked about the landscaping and was that as contemplated. Mr. Berkowsky said yes, and would be part of the site development costs. Mr. Stewart asked for clarification that the Township would be paying for that and the stabilized base as well. Mr. Berkowsky said that was correct.

Mr. Preiss mentioned there were no windows in the gallery space. Mr. Berkowsky stated there were windows at the south entrance, so lighting in Gallery was coming from both vestibules.

Ms. Algeo stated the area they intended on disturbing was only about two acres. There were no wetland, wetland buffers, flood hazard areas or riparian zones known to exist on the property. Property was relatively flat, gently sloping to the south. There was an easement running along the easterly property line, which was 40-FT wide to 75-FT wide. There were also variable utility easements on north side and on the school property. Site access would be from North Main Street, County Route 535 to Park Place West. There were no freestanding signs proposed, only signage on the building. They proposed a connection to the existing Park Place West driveway, and they proposed a 30-FT driveway into parking lot. The site plan does not propose curbing and they were seeking a waiver. They will put curbing abutting the sidewalk on the south side of the parking lot. They were going to increase the sidewalk to six feet as recommended.

Mr. Preiss commented there has been a need established for a sidewalk in order for pedestrians to access the library from the school parking lot. Time would tell if the 20 parking spaces would be sufficient. He felt it may work, but the parking lot could be extended with additional spaces added. This building was attractive and compatible to the surrounded uses and there was not a need to screen the building; the more you see of the building the better. The purpose of the landscaping would only be to provide shade enhancements.

Mr. Hoder stated the applicant addressed the comments he made in his review memo. He mentioned the need for a storm water maintenance plan since this was an underground water quality unit with special needs and not sure the library or public works would be able to handle it.

Mr. Feranda stated many of his comments were addressed. There was No. 2 and 3, under access, dealing with the entrance roadway with emergency access to the site and the site was angled from Park Place West. Also suggested an “S” curve to the driveway entrance rather than a sharp turn and submitted a rough sketch.

Mr. Kehrt asked about the lighting. Mr. Berkowsky mentioned it was a shielded fixture.

Mr. Hasselbach asked what the elevation of library floor was proposed compared to the surrounding area. Mr. Berkowsky said about a foot above. Mr. Hasselbach asked if it was smart to raise it higher. Mr. Berkowsky said he would look into that, but adding the curb on the sidewalk would help.

Mr. Kehrt questioned the contours toward the parking lot on Sheet 5, landscaping & lighting plan.

Mr. Hoder stated the parking lot was in the middle of a “hole” and he had the same concerns as Mr. Hasselbach had. On the north, east and west everything slopes toward the parking lot. The only opening was to the south. He was pleased for the curb installation. The engineer stated it would be enhanced at the swale to push the flow toward the ball field.

Mr. Stewart, noting the plan on the Master Plan would unlikely be developed, but was still shown as a possibility and was still in the Master Plan, stating this current road configuration whether the “S” or the one shown, seemed to have a blind spot for those exiting the parking lot.

Mr. Feranda felt with some pavement could be reconfigured to allow the right-angle connection. It should be done with that in mind, however if done later would incur some costs. Figured into the current design he would recommend straight section with right angles in, if thinking this fully through into the future with the connector road.

Mr. Stewart questioned the underground storm water and the future cost of operation and maintenance.

Ms. Goetz explained the concern with the liability of children falling into an open basin.

Mr. Hasselbach stated it was a major expense for a 2-FT deep water, which should not be

standing that long. He added he was looking at this from a maintenance standpoint and cost effectiveness.

Mr. Kehrt stated the Board was reviewing the engineering as it appears on these drawings.

Mr. Kehrt opened the floor for public comments.

Ms. Cecil noted that she would be swearing in everyone as they speak.

Dr. John Chambers, sworn, noted he was in supportive of the plan and was delighted with the idea of having a separate library. He was however, opposed to the current location of the parking lot and proposed an alternative proposal. In the 19th Century, he explained this was a farming village and what made it charming was the preservation. Cranbury, known as one of the best examples of 19th century agricultural farming village, and this was the only significant space that the Township owns where one can embrace the open space, which was rare and enjoyed by many.

EXHIBIT P-1	Existing Proposed Library by Bill Gittings
EXHIBIT P-2	Alternative as proposed by Bill Gittings
EXHIBIT P-3	Photos

Mr. Bill Gittings, sworn, stated he was affected by this project as an adjacent homeowner. He noted he has worked designing additions for residents in Cranbury and has volunteered for the school, library and in other various capacities for Cranbury, in addition to living here for 15 years. He stated he wanted the outcome to be the best for Cranbury. Mr. Gittings stated the Master Plan had several elements for this site, and their concern was the proposed site plan did not fulfill the original intent of the Master Plan. The parking lot, landscaping, recreational use and open space have now been eliminated by the proposed parking lot. He felt many currently enjoy the vista and felt it needed to be preserved as is. He introduced his alternative design which he felt would preserve the vista, allow for better traffic movement, and give better forward/future thinking for access to the school parking lot (if needed). As proposed, there would be many extraneous traffic movements when parents were dropping their children off and the added traffic for the community rooms, which needed to be addressed since Park Place, could not handle traffic movements as presently designed. The alternative design would allow for turn around, queuing when dropping off/picking up, and maintain the open space vista along with access to utilize the space.

Ms. Goetz agreed it was a beautiful vista and liked this alternative conceptual design, adding that a lot of money has been spent on preserving the open space and keeping this as a peaceful and respectful use of the open space.

Mr. Hasselbach stated it was luck that Chip Wright sold the property, otherwise everyone would still be looking at the greenhouses, trucking, lighting all night and this discussion would not be happening. He agreed Cranbury has changed but everyone needs to look at costs and if everyone wants a vista, they need to pay for it.

Mr. Gittings responded that this design would save money with less maintenance, landscaping, etc.

Mr. Stewart clarified the design costs may be lower because this has to do with the parking and the landscape, not the physical building.

Mr. Axel Thyrum, sworn, stated the alternative design makes for a safer crossing area and this works for everyone.

Ms. Beth Veghte, sworn, was involved in recreation with Cranbury for 25 years. She stated this would allow space for a small sized soccer field, she was willing to work with anyone to get it in there.

Mr. Bill Bunting, Jr., sworn, explained that he was one of the people who saved the current Town Hall from destruction. He stated he was also on the Historical Preservation Society, and stated that the Township has grown and learned a lot. Residents know more about saving property then they did a few years ago, and added the Township had approved a 42-unit housing project right behind the school and the Historical Society went to court to stop it because they wanted to preserve the farmland and vista. They had an expert from Washington DC who stated that vista was priceless. He endorsed anything that preserves the vistas that the Township fought for years. Any design should preserve that vista.

Mr. Walt Ziegler, sworn, stated his family has lived in Cranbury 125 years from his father to his grandfather. Professionally, as part of his architectural years, his goal was to work in downtown to preserve land downtown. He stated he was a member of the Fire Company, and years ago, there had been discussion about having only the one access into the school, the proposed alternative could help that issue of only one access and could add to the value of this design and its location.

Ms. Michelle Gittings, sworn, stated before she came tonight, she watched a woman watching the sunset and the view. This view was accessible to the downtown and every night it was beautiful.

Mr. Kehrt asked Mr. Preiss to state his impression of the alternate scheme.

Mr. Preiss noted the term Master Plan was mentioned several times during this meeting.

Addressing what the Master Plan actually indicates, 2010 was the last major change to the Master Plan which there were two major issues relevant to this discussion, one to preserve that property to the extent possible and a recognition at the time the single entrance to school to Main Street creates a bottleneck along with other problems, including but not limited to safety. The idea was made to create a second means of access for safety reasons and alleviate the bottleneck situation. There was also the suggestion of another parking area in this location, to be used jointly by the municipal complex, school, and public. The alternate does address that process and allows for additional parking to be provided in the future. Mr. Preiss stated the alternate scheme was more consistent with the Master Plan vision for this area and apologized for not noticing that earlier.

Mr. Hoder stated he liked the alternative plan. He felt it would be easier to build any extension to the parking lot in the future. The older proposed plan showed the parking being built in the high part of the site and there was excavation that needed to be made where this alternative plan can be built right on ground with limited excavation. The drainage would allow water to flow to the south and west easier than the other parking lot. Lastly, the alternative was a more compact design preserving more open space.

Mr. Feranda stated the roundabout was a good idea no matter what parking comes in. It was a good entryway for parking and serves a good purpose at the end of Park Place allowing a turn around and acts as a traffic-calming feature. Appropriately landscaped, it can be a nice landscape feature. Buses may have difficulty but it could be sized to accommodate buses initially. The parking spaces in either location were the same, with only difference being the original was off the connector road although it was not different than what goes on in the school parking lot presently. The roundabout and parking in the same direction completes half of that connector as shown was a good idea because of only the small portion needed to finish, or we would be at half the way to doing the right thing for an alternate access.

Mr. Preiss felt if it was 28 to 30-FT wide would give more room to back out of a space and see oncoming traffic. Mr. Feranda agreed wider would be more appropriate.

Mr. Gittings felt the alternate was the best plan for this building taking into consideration any uses in the future.

Mr. Kehrt mentioned that the Board currently had a set of engineered plans that were already paid for and to make changes would result in implications. Mr. Kehrt asked for a response from the library.

Mr. Berkowsky stated he was now going to talk as a resident, and stated he had been in Cranbury for 43 years. He stated they went to the Planning Board and the Township Committee and received guidance all the way through; unfortunately, no one in the existing group of neighbors

had come to the meeting and raised concerns.

Mr. Stewart stated they were not noticed. Mr. Berkowsky argued that they were noticed.

The audience shouted that they were not noticed.

Mr. Berkowsky corrected his statement and mentioned that they were not formally noticed however, they were noticed. He felt he fought very hard, along with Mr. Bunting to preserve this vista. The first part of this vista to be destroyed was done so by the ballfield. The next part to destroy this vista would be the location of the library and the library did not propose it there, it was suggested. The parking lot was not destroying the vista; it was the library that was destroying the vista. He suggested if you want this done properly then shift the library south to maintain the vista. The parking lot location was secondary, and this alternative will not work because of utility easements. He stated the library would throw away \$50,000 dollars in engineering and probably \$50,000 in architectural, but if that will make a better project, then let everybody stand up with their checkbook and let us do it right.

Someone from the public shouted they have.

Mr. Berkowsky stated someone needed to make up his or her mind and give clear direction.

Ms. Kirstie Venanzi, sworn, stated we need this library and will do what it takes to get this library built. She wants everyone behind it and open to the new design but one must realize how far they have come to get to this point. She hoped that this was the clear direction that everyone wants them to take.

Mr. Kehrt noted he was also an architect and licensed planner and felt Mr. Berkowsky has made some good points, but felt the design of the building itself was useable, but believed that they could come up with a good site plan that keeps vista. Mr. Berkowsky noted he had mentioned to Mr. Gittings, "where was he all this time", and was angry that the public hadn't shown up before this.

Mr. Gittings said he already volunteered to help with the design changes in order to save the Township money.

Mr. Berkowsky said it does not work that way.

Mr. Kehrt mentioned there were many talented people in this Town who were engineers and architects, five of whom were in the room. He felt the design of the building was exactly what Cranbury needed; it was the site plan that was the issue.

Mr. Preiss mentioned the uniqueness of the situation. He asked if the library and Township were willing and able to change the plans to something everyone could live with also that and the community supports and affordable.

Ms. Goetz said that as a Township Committee member she and Mr. Johnson could take this back to the Township Committee, but questioned the estimate of the redesign costs.

Mr. Berkowsky stated engineering would be about \$50,000 and the architectural \$50,000 to \$75,000.

Mr. Kehrt stated he disagreed, he felt it could be done in a few hours.

Mr. Berkowsky argued moving the building 40-FT over argued that the parking lot did not destroy the vista as one can look over the parking lot to see the vista.

Mr. Kehrt stated the parking lot was the biggest complaint.

Mr. Gittings suggested sitting down and seeing if they could make this work and see where costs could be saved.

Ms. Callahan said she had no issue with building being further south, but expressed concern the new proposed parking lot would be the “connector”, perhaps for emergency access only, but not as a connecting roadway.

Mr. Kehrt asked about the parking in front of the library.

Ms. Callahan felt that was really up to the Township Committee.

Mr. Stewart said he was hearing it was up to the Planning Board and stated it was not. He asked what the Planning Board was supposed to do. He liked the more compact design and felt the circle solved issues. Compact was better; the circle was better; preserving open space was better.

Mr. Hasselbach thought moving the building south would reduce the costs but as time goes on the price goes on. Police station went from \$1.5 million with a place for the court with a full basement. By the time it was it was built, it was \$4 million and no court or basement. The longer the project prolonged, the price goes up.

Mr. Stewart stated the library could not build tomorrow anyway. There was cost associated with the design change, which was a legitimate issue, but they were not ready to build yet.

Mr. Johnson read aloud two excerpts from Township Committee minutes, both relating to public

meetings relating to Library discussions. In addition, he also mentioned public discussion before the Planning Board and minutes on the public web site.

Ms. Goetz stated if this plan was better than the original proposed plan, it was unfortunate it was not realized two years ago; however, we are obligated to move forward and use a design that was sustainable.

Mr. Kehrt announced carrying this to October 20, 2016. He suggested a design meeting with the library, the neighbors, and the Township professionals.

Ms. Cecil agreed the Board was not in a position to take a definitive position one way or another at this time. Mr. Bush agreed.

In view of the present concerns, a motion was made to carry discussion to October 20, 2016 by Mr. Stewart and Ms. Goetz seconded the motion. Upon motion duly made, seconded, and affirmatively voted up matter carried to October 20, 2016.

Mr. Marlow spoke (portion inaudible).

Mr. Stewart stated a need for a more concrete effort to announcement out on significant projects such as this.

Mr. Chambers asked. "Who reads the minutes all the time?" Mr. Johnson commented that was the point, referring to the public not taking the time to read the announcement and minutes.

Mr. Chambers felt the problem was lacking because of the Cranbury Press not reporting local news; the newspaper needs to cover these topics/meetings.

RESOLUTION

**PB283-16 Ingerman Development Co., LLC
 Block 33, Lot 13.04, Zone R-ML
 2687 US Route 130
 Preliminary Site Plan & Bulk Variances**

Ms. Cecil noted there were two changes made by the applicant. Both were minor; makes sure the civil engineer was identified as the planner (he played dual roles). Another change was a condition on Page 10 out of 11 pages, condition states, "affordable housing deed restriction to assure compliance to COAH . . ."; change to read as follows, "the 90 units of housing approved for development on the property shall be part of the Cranbury Township Affordable Housing

program and subject to all applicable Cranbury Township Affordable Housing ordinance regulations as well as applicable COAH and the rules and of Section 42 Internal Revenue Code and NJHFA, in the event of any conflict the rules and regulations of Section 42 Internal Revenue Code and NJHFA shall control. (NOTE – background noise on audio, from audience made difficult to hear).

Motion was made with changes as noted.

MOTION MADE: Ms. Callahan
MOTION SECONDED: Ms. Goetz

VOTE ROLL CALL

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

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARING & RESOLUTION

AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE PLAN ELEMENT OF THE CRANBURY TOWNSHIP MASTER PLAN PERTAINING TO THE HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL AND GENERAL COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICTS

Mr. Preiss presented his report.

Mr. Hasselbach questioned the difference between the Highway Commercial and the General Commercial when some of the uses in the General Commercial would not be serviced by sewer or water; was it not a waste to list uses that would never occur in that area do to the present restrictions. He commented the most effective way to resolve the problem would be to have discussion with the real estate and retail establishments and have a complete amendment that would last for years. He did express appreciation to Mr. Johnson for all his work and understanding the need for the need for tax revenue.

Mr. Kehrt asked for clarification if there were more permitted uses then wanted.

Mr. Hasselbach stated there should not be a segregation between north and south end.

Mr. Preiss explained that zoning was not necessarily changed because of inquiries; however, markets do change. He agreed it was more inclusive and agreed that 80% to 90% of the uses were more likely to come here but there was no harm in listing allowed uses in the event it does happen. He stated, in terms of the uses listed in the other part was not done on basis of a site suitability analysis. Zoning was based on the types of uses that make sense to be located/built in certain places in the community and those added to the GC zone where not considered suitable for the HC zone from a general land use compatibility point of view.

Mr. Fran McGovern, sworn, stated he had an issue with a previous application dealing with a rehabilitation application and this amendment should include more clearly defined language to avoid litigation on certain uses.

Mr. Preiss clarified that the term “assisted living” was a term that was defined in licensed by the Department of Health, and does not include drug rehabilitation facilities. This provision was being added since has been inquires to transform particular uses to assisted living facilities for the elderly.

Ms. Cecil stated there were two independent thoughts going; the addition of health care and social assistance offices and other health related facilities in the HC Zone and that point was well taken. Separate from that was the definition adding assisted living facilities and she agreed with Mr. Preiss on assisted living could not be interpreted as drug rehabilitation.

Mr. McGovern asked if the term “exclusively for” be added to the frail elderly.

Ms. Cecil felt the health care and social offices could have added excluded drug rehabilitation.

Further discussion occurred in order to fine-tune the wording in order to meet both needs, however there was a need to avoid litigation with terminology used.

Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Johnson for his opinion. Mr. Johnson suggested the elimination up to home health care services.

Mr. Kehrt stated he had no issue with a drug rehabilitation facility in Cranbury.

Mr. McGovern stated he felt the HC zone was too close to the Village.

Mr. Callahan agreed with Mr. Johnson’s recommendation.

Mr. Hasselbach stated as long as it was defensible, as with houses of worship.

Ms. Cecil stated Mr. Johnson suggested eliminating, “health care and social assistance office, and other health related facilities including and not limited . . .” Therefore, what would be permitted would be home health care services, diagnostic imagining centers, outpatient care centers and blood/organ facilities.

Ms. Goetz asked if there was an ability to keep special social assistant offices.

Mr. Stewart moved to adopt with the changes as discussed.

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

VOTE ROLL CALL

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

MOTION CARRIED

Ms. Cecil would make changes the draft resolution to included wording subject to revising it to reflect the language changes as discussed.

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

VOTE ROLL CALL

AYES: Ms. Callahan, Ms. Goetz, Mr. Hasselbach, Mr. Johnson,
Mr. Stewart, Mr. Kehrt
NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Schilling

MOTION CARRIED

MINUTES

July 21, 2016, August 4, 2016, August 24, 2016

Upon a motion made and seconded the minutes were approved.

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 September 15, 2016 consisting of 17 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 NOVEMBER 17, 2016.

Josette C. Kratz, Secretary

/jck