



EWING TOWNSHIP REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MUNICIPAL COMPLEX * 2 JAKE GARZIO DRIVE, EWING, NJ 08628 *

(609) 883-2900 ext. 7648 * FAX (609) 882-0208

MINUTES

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 15, 2017

CALL TO ORDER: 7:11 PM

Opening Statement (Sunshine Law) - Commissioner Kull
Roll Call – Mr Latini

Present: Commissioner Kull; Commissioner Coleman-Boatwright; Mirabella;
Carter; (Stokes arrived 7:20pm)
Absent: Kearns-Latini; Murphy

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion to approve - Coleman-Boatwright. Second Mirabella. Approved 4-0

MINUTES

February 1 – Motion to approve Mirabella. Second Carter. Approved 4-0-1
(Carter abstained)

NEW BUSINESS:

Redevelopment Project Presentation – Nassimi Corp.

- Attending:
 - Steve Nehmad, ESQ – Attorney; Michael Nassimi – Owner; Greg DiBouna – Bohler Engineering
 - Mayor Steinmann; Kevin McManimon – Ewing Redevelopment Counsel

- Mr McManimon introduced the Nassimi Team. Based on the Redevelopment Plan, Nassimi seeks amendments to the Redevelopment Plan as the project is not currently permitted. Nassimi seeks both mandatory elements as well as those aspirational elements of the Plan to change because of their tenant's (Walmart) experience in defending appeals post approval. Plan amendments will be subject to separate ask of the Township Council. The Nassimi Team presented a power point. (attached)

- Project includes 3.5 spaces per 1000 SF (168,318 total SF)
 - Components – Supermarket; tire store; auto lube; gas station; online ordering pickup service; drive thru pharmacy; garden center, etc:
- Q&A- From ETRA
 - Q. Why this site and size?
 - A.→ Walmart’s decision making is proprietary.
 - Q. Will this compete with the new Town center at GM?
 - A.→We think its complimentary
 - Q. What other retailers will come?
 - A.→Perhaps (with no commitment to) a petsmart; chickfilla; panda express, etc...
 - Q. Chairman Kull - Should Council see fit to amend plan we feel more variation in the façade elements would be necessary. ?
 - A.→Walmart feels they have exhausted it ability to add further design elements. Mr. Latini added that the reason the project is at this point is that the Township has exhausted all negotiation and the project is at an impasse whereby it requires the public to decide if the Plan should be amended to accommodate this project or not.
- Q&A - Public
 - Ask to not vote tonight until Council and community discussion can take place – George Steward.
 - Q. D. Cox - What is the timeline on the project approvals?
 - A.→ Project still needs to be hard engineered. Council needs to hear plan amendments, etc. We don’t have a timeline.
 - Q. C. Stewart – There is a lot of asphalt. Trees need to be added?
 - A.→ Landscape Plan needs to be detailed and the applicant will work on it. Impervious coverage however is an issue because of the need to cap the environmental issues.
 - Q. D. Lyons – Traffic is going to be an issue. What are the improvements we are going to need to make this work?
 - A.→ Mitigation measures will be proposed once the traffic study is complete.
 - Q. L Farnham – Traffic for the once proposed Lowes necessitated the need for improvements. I’d like to know the status of the improvement and the West Trenton bypass.
 - A.→ These issues will be studied and made part of the development review process. Applicant will have a better idea on timing once Council decides on the Redevelopment plan amendments.
 - Q. M. Wells – Traffic should be done now, not studied after.
 - A.→ This project is a divergence from the Redevelopment Plan. If ETRA moves it forward merely moves this discussion to where it truly belongs, in front of the public at Council for them to decide if it is what they feel is appropriate for the Township.

Q. R. Prykanowski – Have you studied the market? What is the target of this project?

A.→ The applicant believes there is a market for this use, but the details of Walmart's decision making are proprietary.

Q. A. Stienberger. – Big picture, what does the Township get out of this project. Integration with the existing community and its direction is critical? Projects needs sidewalks and amenities for surrounding neighborhoods.

Q. C. Stewart – What are the divergences from the Redevelopment Plan? We are talking Plan amendments , but not talking Plan amendments?

Q. Other questions/comments on plantings, traffic, additional studied were asked.

A.→ The process will unfold at Council. Agenda will be advertised.

Chairman Kull closed Q&A by stating we have had an hour or presentation, and an hour of discussion. We need to decide the question of whether we are advancing the Redevelopment Agreement so that the bigger questions of Plan amendments can then occur.

Called for interest by the Commissioners to go into Closed Session if there were details of the negotiation that the Agency needed to discuss.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

(Matters of Negotiation).

Motion to go into Executive Session – Commissioner Mirabella. Second by Stokes.

Discussion on the details of the Redevelopment Agreement and its potential impacts if moved/not moved.

Motion to reopen the public hearing. Commissioner Stokes. Second Mirabella.

NEW BUSINESS (Cont)

Discussion on Redevelopment Agreement.

Mr. McManimon ran through all the details which allows the property owner to continue to move forward to the public and the governing body. The agreement does not endorse the Plan amendments, it merely provides the developer the understanding that if the Council amends the plan that the Agency is willing to work with what the public decides is appropriate without delay.

Resolution to approve given the discussion would be memorized at the next Agency meeting.

Motion to Approved – Commissioner Mirabella. Second Commissioner Coleman-Boatwright. Approved 5-0

ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn 9:59pm. Commissioner Stokes – Coleman-Boatwright.
Yes 5-0

NEXT SCHEDULED ETRA MEETING WEDNESDAY March 1, 2016