

ROBBINSVILLE TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
ROBBINSVILLE TOWNSHIP, MERCER COUNTY, NJ  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2014 7:30 P.M. – SENIOR CENTER  
MINUTES

**Present:** Mr. Barker, Mr. Heilman, Mr. Shennard, Ms. Breyta, Mr. Witt, Mrs. Goodwine, Mr. Silvestrov, Chairman Cettina

**Absent:** Mr. Kolibas, Mrs. Van Nest, Mr. Galluccio

**Also Present:** Mr. McGough, Township Engineer; Mr. Dasti, Esq., Board Attorney; Mr. Wisner, Planning Consultant; Mr. Gibson, Engineering Consultant; Mr. Wilson, Architectural Consultant; Ms. Post, Board Secretary

**ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Cettina. Roll call for the above members was called.

**SUNSHINE STATEMENT**

Chairman Cettina read the following statement: “Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided as required under Chapter 231, P.L. 1975, specifying the time and place, with such notices being sent to the *Times of Trenton*, the *Messenger Press* and the *Trentonian* and being posted on the Municipal Building Public Notice Bulletin Board.”

**FLAG SALUTE**

The Board members present led the public in the salute to the flag.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Chairman Cettina stated that everyone should have received an electronic copy of the 2014 Financial Disclosure Notice and their pin number in the mail. The filing will be done electronically.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chairman Cettina asked for a motion to open the meeting to public comment for matters not related to items on the agenda. A motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mr. Barker to open the meeting to the public. All in favor. Since no one from the public came forward to address the Board, a motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mrs. Goodwine to close the public portion of the meeting. All in favor.

**REPORT OF OFFICERS & COMMITTEES**

There were no reports.

**BOARD COMMENTS**

There were no Board comments.

**BUSINESS TO DISCUSS**

**Application PB14-04-01 – Windsor Industrial Park Associates, Limited****Windsor Industrial Park****Block 14, Lot 54****92 North Main Street****Zoning: OW****Request for Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval**

The applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval to demolish two existing 12,000 square foot buildings and construct one 30,000 square foot warehouse/office building along with associated parking, loading and circulation areas, landscaping and lighting on a 39.54 acre lot known as Windsor Industrial Park.

The applicant was represented by attorney William J. Mehr, Esq. of Freehold, New Jersey. Mr. Mehr cited a brief history of the site. This site was the former Mack Lumber yard and it has been owned by the applicant since 1982. The buildings proposed to be demolished are two of the original buildings that actually stored lumber in the park. The buildings were modified over the years and are two of the older buildings in the industrial park. Each of those older buildings is 12,000 square feet and they are proposing to construct a 30,000 square feet building in the overall footprint on this site. That is his overview of the proposed project. He has two witnesses that will be testifying for the applicant.

Mr. Dasti swore in Michael Geller, PE. Mr. Geller stated that he is a partner at Geller Sive & Company and will be testifying as a professional engineer and planner. He has 39 years experience and has been a professional engineer since 1980 and a professional planner since 1983. He is also a certified municipal engineer since 1991 in the State of New Jersey. He has testified before numerous Boards and has also served as the Planning Board Engineer in Lacey Township in Ocean County. He was employed by Sussex County Engineering Department in the 1970's and he has testified as both an engineer and a planner as well as representing Boards as engineer and planner throughout his career.

Mr. Geller was accepted by the Board as an expert witness.

Mr. Mehr asked Mr. Geller if he was the engineer on this project. Mr. Geller replied yes. Mr. Mehr asked him to mark the exhibits. Mr. Geller marked the aerial showing the entire Windsor Industrial Park site as Exhibit A-1, which was prepared by Geller Sive & Company on May 28, 2014. His second rendering is of the site plan showing the proposed building in the location of the existing buildings, which he will mark as Exhibit A-2 and is also dated May 28, 2014. He distributed individual copies of the exhibits to the Board members and professionals. The site is located on the northerly side of Main Street, which coincides with Route 130/33 and then travels south into Windsor. Windsor Industrial Park is located on the north side of Main Street, Block 14, Lot 54. The site consists of 39.5 acres and is located in the Office Warehouse Light Manufacturing (OW) Zone, which has a minimum area requirement of 5 acres. This site is much larger than what is required by ordinance. The site is occupied by numerous buildings that have been improved over the years and were existing. In the 1990's Mr. Geller represented the applicant when he was proposing Buildings 19 and 20, which are on the southerly end of the site and are the newest buildings in the park. Buildings 8 and 9 are immediately north of Building 20. It is a yellow hatched area on the aerial, Exhibit A-1. It is an area of 1.88 acres of the 39.5 acre site. The site is also served by a main access drive off Main Street. There are circulation paved aisles all around giving access adequately to all the buildings. All of the buildings are served with parking areas. There is a stormwater management wet pond in the northerly portion and another detention basin in the southerly portion of the site. There are wetlands in the immediate southern area and all of that serves to provide for stormwater management.

Mrs. Goodwine asked him to point out the two buildings for her.

---

Mr. Geller pointed out the two buildings, 8 and 9, which are in the double-hashed area on the rendering. The proposal is to raze these two buildings and construct a 30,000 square foot flex warehouse/office building. The building will be more warehouse than office. The rendering shows two areas of 3,750 square feet and an area that is flexed for 22,500 square feet. It is approximately a 75% / 25% split of warehouse to office space and that was done with the purpose of calculating parking in accordance with the town's ordinance. The building will be served by a formal paved parking lot marked in the front. A predominant of the parking spaces is proposed. There are 30 foot wide aisles between the adjacent buildings and the proposed building to give access to the rear. In the rear it is shown that there are five marked loading spaces as well as loading docks that go down and there is a 3.5 foot difference in the loading dock elevation. On the northerly portion of the rear of the building, there is at grade space for access into the building in that location. The spaces meet the ordinance requirement as to the number for this size building. Stormwater management is proposed by a series of inlets in the rear that will take on roof drainage as well as surface drainage from the rear portion of the site. In the front there is an inlet situated in one of the main access drives and that would be piped there as well as the parking lot drainage, which drains to an inlet as well as the roof drainage from the front portion of the building. There is no increase in runoff since the impervious surfaces of the site have been balanced from the existing to the proposed development situation. That will be the way stormwater management runoff will be managed. They have provided the runoff calculations to the Board's engineer to demonstrate that. One assumption that they did make was that there are many areas on the existing site that are very hard packed gravel and they did soil boring in those areas and confirmed that the soils are very heavy clay and gravel packed on top of that. It is essentially an impervious surface. The town ordinance looks at gravel stone areas and treats them in a runoff perspective as if they are impervious. Therefore, they have concluded that the runoff calculation in post-developed conditions theoretically will be less based on the numbers. As far as the Board's concerns, it is going to be a wash from existing to the post from a stormwater management perspective. There is an 8 foot by 15 foot area for the trash enclosure situated in the northeasterly corner of the parking lot in the rear.

Mr. Mehr asked if there is an employee location outside the building as required by ordinance.

Mr. Geller answered that an employee area has been provided in the front. It is drawn on the plan and labeled as a post paver block pedestrian area. There is a bench and a refuge area where the employees can congregate, which meets the ordinance requirement.

Mr. Dasti asked where it is located. Mr. Geller said it is located in the front right corner of the building in the pedestrian area.

Mr. Geller stated that there are two submission waivers that they are requesting that he will point out to the Board. Checklist item I-13 is a traffic report and analysis of the park. There was a traffic analysis done recently and this is the existing retrofit to it. They are taking down an existing building and replacing it with the proposed building. It is a flex situation so there won't be a net increase or any impact on traffic. He believes that is an appropriate waiver. It is the same situation with Checklist items I-15 for Community Impact Assessment and I-19 for Environmental Impact Assessment and III-9 Boundary and Topographic Survey of the entire tract. It would be cumbersome to require 39.5 acres to be surveyed. They have done a survey of the area in question both from a boundary perspective and a graphic perspective of the area in question. Because this is an existing site and has a long history of operation, the waivers that are being requested are appropriate.

Mr. Witt asked Mr. McGough if he concurred with Mr. Geller. Mr. McGough answered that he does concur with all four of those waivers.

Mr. Geller said as far as the review process to date, there was a TRC Meeting that was conducted by the Board's professionals on May 7, 2014. They prepared a revised layout plan that was a separate one sheet

---

submission on May 15, 2014, which they submitted to the Board along with the runoff calculations that he just alluded to. Following that, there were no new reports rendered so they are going to request that in regards to the old reports, how should they address the items cited in the reports before the Board.

Mr. Mehr said to be clear, the map up there now what Mr. Geller is going to testify will be added to the plan to satisfy the requirements in the reports.

Mr. Geller said yes. The rendering depicts what was shown on the revised sheet layout plan, sheet 4, 12 in the set. He first focused on Mr. McGough's report.

Mr. McGough asked if Mr. Geller was referring to his own report as well. Just so the Board knows Mr. Geller has a letter that has responses to all the Board's professional reports. So you can follow along with that as we go through the letters. He is sure Mr. Geller is going to testify to basically what he said here. There are some changes. The plan that came before the TRC, they provided letters, but they didn't think that there was anything substantial that they would need to submit a revised set of plans. The changes that were made, the applicant will testify to what they were.

Chairman Cettina asked if one of those changes is the two office proposed areas, but on the plan there is only one. Mr. McGough said that is correct.

Mr. Mehr said that this is a flex building. It could develop in a lot of different ways, percentage of office to warehouse - it could be less, it could be more.

Chairman Cettina asked if it is intended for one use.

Mr. Mehr said that it is 30,000 square foot building so it is more than likely going to be two or three users. The point of it is that you cannot actually tell until you have tenants and they will have to justify parking at that time. They use this as the basis to say 25/75. They have enough parking on site and will testify to that with the understanding that it may change.

Mr. Geller said that loading spaces have been shown in an approximate location. When they get tenants, the spaces may shift a little bit. The only thing that is fixed is the at-grade access to the building. As to the parking in the back and the loading spaces, he site lends itself that they may shift.

Mr. Mehr said that the architect's plan show the maximum number of spaces.

Mr. Geller said to start with Mr. McGough's report, the first item dealt with parking setback on the rear side of the lot, which is at the bottom of the rendering, the southerly property line of the industrial park. The minimum requirement is 20 feet from any parking area. The plan has been revised to dimension and is not setback 24.2 feet from the proposed edge of pavement to the southerly property. The second comment had to do with site signage. On sheet #4 that was submitted, there is a note #2 that indicates that all future signage shall require a zoning permit prior to installation and shall comply with Section 142-48 of the Robbinsville Township Land Use Code for signage requirements. There are three items under number three in the report that dealt with off street parking, loading areas and driveways. Item 3a pertains to the curbing waiver being technically required from the parking and loading areas to the rear of the building. All of the peripheries of the site occur as required by the ordinance with the exception of the rear of the parking lot. The reason for that was the existing site is geared toward sheet flow in that area and to allow for sheet flow of stormwater runoff to continue in its natural path into the proposed grassed area.

Chairman Cettina asked Mr. McGough if he agreed with Mr. Geller. Mr. McGough said yes.

Mr. Geller said in regards to item 3b, loading space requirements are based upon a number of the 30,000 square feet. Four loading areas are technically required by ordinance. Sheet 4 of 12 show five areas depicted in the rendering and the dimensions are 14 feet by 16 feet as required. Item 3c has a trash requirement pickup location. They have a garbage pickup location in the rear right corner or the northeasterly corner of the site. As far as parking requirements are concerned, the rendering and sheet 4 of the plans have been revised to show the two office spaces comprising of 7,500 square feet and the remainder of the warehouse space being 22,500 square feet. Office use requires parking at 1 space per 250 square feet gross floor area and warehouse space at a rate of 1 space per 4,000 square feet plus 1 parking stall per employee on a larger shift. Therefore, the 7,500 square foot office requires 30 spaces and the 22,500 square foot warehouse requires 7 spaces. The assumed 17 warehouse employees on the larger shift, and that was taken as a number that could be a limitation on how the plans eventually develop, requires 17 additional stalls. So 54 stalls are required and 54 are provided in the combined parking areas. The fourth comment in Mr. McGough's report pertains to lighting height and spacing. Sheet 7 of 12 indicates a pole mounting height of 20 feet. Section 142-37A requires a full mounting height of 20 feet. The plans will be revised such as the spacing between the proposed lighting does not exceed 4 times the mounting height and that is what the ordinance dictates. Item 5 pertains to the lighting intensity and the plan will be revised to meet that standard. Item 6 refers to landscape planting areas. The ordinance requires a minimum of one planting island equivalent to 9 feet by 18 feet in area for every 5 parking stalls or equivalent island or grouping of islands in total area. In this case, the islands that have been shown as far as the landscape island in the front, show two groups at the end of the front parking stall facing the building and the two strips adjacent to the rear parking area. The total of that area is 3,223 square feet whereas landscape required by ordinance is 1,782 square feet, which shows that their calculation does meet the landscape area requirements. It is an industrial site and there are not a lot of opportunities with the need for circulation and truck movements, but that is what this site lends itself to as far as landscape planting areas. Item 7 in Mr. McGough's report dealt with a need for bicycle space on site and they are asking for a waiver from that provision. This is an industrial park and he doesn't know if there will be employees arriving by bicycle in this type of operation. Item 8 refers to outdoor pedestrian spacing, which they have already previously provided testimony as to this being located in the front corner of the building. Items 9-12 are generic conditions that are commonplace on any approval and will be provided pending approval by the Board. Item 13 pertains to outside agency approvals. Mercer County Planning Board was obtained on May 14, 2014 with no conditions. As to Mercer County Soil Conservation District, they had a review from them and their resubmission is pending. The approval from Robbinsville Fire Department is also pending.

Mr. Geller stated that the second set of review was Remington Vernick Engineer's review letter dated May 12, 2014. He will only address the items that are not indicated on Mr. McGough's report. Section 4 – Performance Standards - Item 3 dealt with circulation plan requirements. Sheet 4 of 12 has been revised to show traffic arrows and no parking fire lanes along the side, which is a circulation requirement. The no parking fire lanes also addresses one of the Fire Department's comments as well. Item 4a dealt with stop bars. Stop bars are indicated at all stop signs. 4c dealt with trailer parking. These are trailers that may be left overnight. There is an area on the site designated for trailer parking, which takes the place of what would have been a loading space. That is a place where trailers can park. Item 7 is a requirement pertaining to the paving section. They will propose a heavy duty pavement section for all drive aisles and parking and loading areas that will accommodate tractor trailer traffic as required by ordinance. Section 5 is landscaping and exterior lighting. There is a comment about light intensity and the lighting plan will be revised. The light fixtures will have a bulb no greater than 100 watts. That is the technical requirement of the ordinance. Section 6 pertains to stormwater management. Item 1 addresses stormwater runoff destinations. They have reviewed the existing site conditions and the revised site layout, which proposes additional landscaped islands. Based upon on existing impervious coverage, which includes pavement, concrete, stone/ graveled areas and proposed impervious areas, the proposed site layout maintains all the existing coverage so there will be no increase in runoff based on the coverage calculations. The net balance satisfies the fact that there is no need for individual stormwater management. The runoff from this enters a

detention pond, and there are wetlands and a wet pond north of this so in his opinion there is plenty of stormwater management on the already developed site. Items 2-4 under stormwater management are relatively minor comments that they will address and satisfy with the engineer.

Mr. Geller commented on a letter from CHA dated April 30, 2014 from the sanitary sewer engineer. One of those comments is technical in nature and they will satisfy the town's sanitary sewer consultant. There is a sanitary sewer that runs down the middle between Buildings 8 & 9. With the construction of a new building there is a need to relocate the sewer and that is the essence of the entire sanitary sewer application and they will satisfy CHA's comments in that regard.

Mr. Geller said the last comment is in the Robbinsville Fire Company review letter stamped May 5, 2014. One of the requirements was there be no parking along both side lanes along the building, which he has already addressed. The other comment is the fire suppression building connection requirement. The plan will be revised to show a hydrant connection to the building. No plan revisions are required by the Township Construction Official, Police Department, Tax Assessor and Affordable Housing Liaison.

Mr. Geller summarized that the two design waivers being requested related to the curbing along the rear southerly edge of pavement to maximize drainage sheet flow proposed and the other is for the bicycle spaces.

The next witness was Steve Gran Wityk who was sworn by the Board Attorney. Mr. Wityk has been a licensed architect since the late 70's and he has prepared the architectural plans for this project. He has previously appeared before Boards.

Mr. Wityk introduced three exhibits marked as Exhibit A-3 – Architectural Renderings, Exhibit A-4 – Overall Floor Layout and Exhibit A-5 – Color Rendering of the Proposed Building, which were all prepared by Mr. Wityk. Mr. Wityk described the building as a steel frame masonry metal panel building. They tried to use the same construction materials as the more recent newer buildings in the park like Buildings 18 and 20. They use a combination of masonry split face concrete block with an earth tone (brown) color. The rear and side of the building will be a metal panel like a neutral color. Midway through the building there will be a band of windows. The overall concept is to continue the concept of the existing buildings such as Buildings 18, 16, 19 and 20. They want to mimic the masonry, color and metal panels of Buildings 19 and 20 to have some continuity. The height would be 28 feet 4 inches on the high end and 25 feet on the low end with a single pitch roof. They did update the drawing to reflect that on the end wall. They are keeping the parapet elevation, which is what was requested. Mr. Mehr said that this allows for a series of five double doors for entrances. Theoretically, that could be broken down. Mr. Wityk added that is the maximum number. Mr. Mehr said if there were only two or three tenants in the building, it is not necessary, but at any time they could be added. Mr. Wityk said yes. Mr. Mehr said that theoretical there are 9 loading docks and 1 drive through. The assumption under this plan is that if the potential 3 loading docks on the left side of the building were eliminated, it would still meet the requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Wityk agreed. Mr. Mehr said that if some of these loading docks were required, they could revert back to this. This is the maximum layout that Mr. Wityk has laid out. Mr. Wityk agreed. He described one of the renderings as the coloration reflecting the existing buildings. They are looking to do an earth tone color, split face block, a band of windows that are accentuated with the same color, but with a split brick block. They have the coloration band that goes completely around the building and they identify each canopy with a different color to identify the entrance as office space. Essentially the coloration will follow all the way around.

Chairman Cettina asked Mr. Wilson if his concerns were satisfied. Mr. Wilson answered that the only significant request was that they continue the copings of the long sloping roofs at a constant horizontal

---

pitch, which they have done. This is the first time that he has seen the picture depicted as described in his memo so he is satisfied.

Mr. Witt said that there was a comment made about trying to maintain moving towards the light source. Has that been established? Also the continuity of the same light standard in the park

Mr. Wilson does not believe that was discussed, but they can discuss it now. At the TRC meeting there was a suggestion made by Mr. McGough, which he supported, that this picture of the inside lighting become the new standard for the park. The light source whether it is metal halide or other be also a new standard for the park so there is not a mixing of light color temperature so there will be uniformity across the site.

Mr. Mehr commented that the light structures throughout the park now are basically metal halide in the box type. To switch now would be difficult. It is the intention that over some years to upgrade some of the other buildings in the park. As an example, this project razing two buildings of 24,000 square feet and constructing a 30,000 square feet building is like a \$2 million dollar project. You can't do a lot of them at any one point in time and still keep the economics of the park going.

Mr. Witt understood that, but the concern is as you continue to do improvements, they are looking to establish a standard of lighting moving forward.

Mr. Mehr agreed with that, but they will continue what is there which is the shoe box type metal halide.

Chairman Cettina stated that there isn't an issue. They are just trying to point out that they want some uniformity and consistency. It sounds like you are doing that with the building construction by mimicking the other buildings so you already have four buildings that are starting to look the same.

Mr. Wilson said that they would have some uniformity in terms of the light fixtures and the light source. A metal halide is a fine light source.

Mr. Mehr said that they do not have really high fixtures. There is a maximum of 20 feet in height. There is no stadium effect.

Mr. Wilson stated that as long as the fixture type and light source is continued, it satisfies his concern.

Mr. Witt said that there was also some commentary about making sure that the uses were going to be in conformance with the office warehouse as far as tenants.

Mr. Mehr responded that they don't know who the tenants are at this point in time. If is a use situation that is not supported by the ordinance, then the applicant has to come back to the Board.

Mr. Witt said that the last thing that he saw in Mr. Wilson's letter was recommending that the applicant provide testimony on sustainability.

Mr. Wilson remarked that comment is common in his review letters. In fact the building will be designed where practicable to be sustainable ("Green") and energy efficient.

Mr. Witt raised this comment because nothing jumped out at him as being sustainable. He was questioning why that comment was there.

Mr. Wilson said that even buildings of this type can be designed to be energy efficient and with sustainable materials. The concrete masonry is sustainable. However, he won't testify.

Mr. Wityk answered that they are using concrete masonry that is sustainable and the building code does provide guidelines for energy efficiency, whether it is electric lighting, plumbing, HVAC or insulation so they do plan on complying with that comment.

Mr. Wilson mentioned that the other comment pertained to whether the building would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, which is now part of the state code.

Mr. Wityk answered that they do address that with the main entrance, which is shown to be appropriate, and interior work once you get into the tenant space.

Mr. Wilson said that you do have to make whatever adjustment that need to be made at that time.

Mr. Shennard asked Mr. McGough if he was okay with waiving the bicycle rack.

Mr. McGough said that he is not sure why they have it in there because he has never seen a bicycle outside any of the office warehouse buildings.

Mr. Shennard said that at the last TRC meeting, they made them mark out an area for possible overnight storage for trailers. It's flexible because they don't know who the tenants are, but there is a requirement for overnight storage. As you build out as your proposal says, you have all nine bays across the back, now where do you propose to locate it.

Mr. Mehr said that they would not be able to do that. They show theoretically 9 bays for spacing. In order to get sufficient parking, what we have now is a parking plan based on 25/75 basis that says you can have up to 17 employees in the warehouse at the maximum. They wanted to make sure that they always provide enough parking so that is why a portion is grayed out to show 54 spaces. A space was taken out of there so now this area becomes sufficient to park up to two trailers next to each other on a daily basis.

Chairman Cettina said that based on your statement, depending on your tenant and the usage, you will adjust the parking accordingly.

Mr. Mehr said yes. This is the problem with percentages because whatever you use is not going to be perfect.

Mr. Dasti noted this would be a matter that they would bring to the attention of the Zoning Officer.

Mr. Mehr said that they would know exactly how many at that point in time. There is a lot of spaces around for additional parking and periodically someone will have a need for more spaces for a period of time because they are doing training or whatever and they will find places for those people to park.

Mrs. Breyta asked if mechanical equipment for heating and air conditioning would all be on the roof. Is anything intended to be on the ground?

Mr. Wityk answered that they really haven't addressed that, but the mechanicals can be placed on the roof or inside the building.

Ms. Breyta said that she did not see electric or gas on the utility plan. She asked if he knew where that would be located because for the adjacent building there are notations that the gas and electric are coming in from the driveway. If you look to the left on the plan, there is a guardrail.

Michael McCloskey, the property manager, was sworn by the Board Attorney. He testified that presently there are two existing buildings and the electric for both comes from the rear. They would expect any service coming from the rear not from the side. All of the utilities would be located in the rear of the property.

Ms. Breyta mentioned that she is a frequent visitor of the park. When you enter the park, you make a left onto the main boulevard. That intersection is difficult to negotiate because there is not a lot of painting or curbing and there is a loading dock for the building that is there. She asked if the applicant is anticipating any road improvements or painting or something to make it a little clearer.

Mr. McCloskey said that they have frequently discussed it. The tenants in that corner are expanding out and won't have the situation that there is now with parking all along that back area. It has always been an intersection that doesn't have a lot of definition. They can easily put in striping to define the lane more easily.

Ms. Breyta said with the increase of traffic, she thinks that the applicant should at least consider that to make it safer.

Mr. Mehr said that they could do that.

Mr. McGough asked to go back to Mr. Shennard's question about bicycles. The requirement in the ordinance says that a minimum of 5 bicycle spaces should be provided for every 15,000 square feet of retail space and 5 bicycle spaces for every 30,000 square feet of office space. This is a flex space so you don't know what it will be in the future, but you may want to make it a condition when you find out what the use will be. It is not difficult to put bike racks. You can make it under the jurisdiction of the Zoning Officer.

Mr. Mehr emphasized that there really isn't any bike traffic throughout the park so there is no reason to expect it. Mr. McCloskey added that they would discourage bike riding in an industrial park.

Mr. McGough said that is what the ordinance says, but if you wanted to make it a condition of any potential future uses and revisit this, you can make it the jurisdiction of the Zoning Officer.

Mr. Dasti said for now you can say that the design waiver is denied without prejudice, but depending upon the type of use that comes in, the Zoning Officer will communicate with the applicant.

Mr. McGough commented that the situation is that someone could work in that building and want to ride a bike. This individual could come back to him and say that he nor the Board allowed the applicant to have a bike rack. To be without prejudice means that sometime in the future the Board and the Zoning Board are covered.

Chairman Cettina asked for a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Witt made the motion and Mr. Shennard seconded. All in favor. Since no one from the public came forward to address the Board, Mr. Witt made the motion to close to the public and Mr. Barker seconded. All in favor.

There were no further Board comments.

Mr. Dasti summarized that this is an application seeking the approval to construct a new 30,000 square foot building to replace Buildings 8 and 9, each of which are 12,000 square feet. The applicant has requested waivers from the requirement to provide for a Traffic Report, Community Impact Statement, Environmental Impact Statement and Boundary Survey of the Entire Tract. Mr. McGough indicated that those waivers should be granted. Two more design waivers were requested. One was to not allow curbing along the

south side of the parking space to allow for the sheet flow for on-site drainage to a grassed area. There was no issue with regard to that. The last waiver request was for the provision of a bicycle rack. That waiver request was denied without prejudice subject to discussion with the Zoning Officer at the time the particular uses are determined. The applicant has provided testimony from the architect that it will be ADA compliant. It is going to be a green building. There is going to be continuity with the existing lighting and the existing look of the building in terms of the color and earth tone and single pitch roof. Mr. Geller has testified extensively that the applicant will comply with all of the detailed requirements of the various engineering and professional reports. There will be no increase in runoff post versus preconstruction. It is two proposed office buildings of 3,700 sq. ft. each and the flex warehouse will be about 22,500 with 5 loading docks and a truck loading space.

Mr. Witt mentioned that they did also agree to provide some striping. Mr. Dasti agreed. There would be striping along the entrance driveway (first T-Intersection).

Mr. Shennard asked if the curbing is off the south side or east side of the structure. Mr. Dasti said that it is off the southeast side.

Chairman Cettina asked for a vote to approve the site plan. Mr. Witt made the motion and Mr. Shennard seconded to approve the application as outlined by Mr. Dasti in his summarization.

**ROLL CALL:**

AYES: Barker, Heilman, Shennard, Breyta, Witt, Goodwine, Silvestrov, Cettina

NAYS: None

ABSTAINS: None

There being eight (8) votes in favor and no nay or abstain votes, the application was approved.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Shennard made a comment that he was one of the ones against the Hankins Road application to put sidewalks down Route 130. Now that the temple is going in, he noticed a lot of pedestrian traffic walking down that highway coming out of East Windsor. There is a section there where you could possibly put sidewalks. He just wanted to put it out there for the next applicant that may come along.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Mr. Witt and seconded by Mr. Barker to adjourn the meeting. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elide M. Post  
 Planning Board Secretary

Transcribed by: Jewel Timberlake-Morgan

**Adopted: September 17, 2014**