

WEST WINDSOR TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
June 6, 2018

The June 6, 2018 meeting of the West Windsor Township Planning Board was called to order by Chair Gene O'Brien at 7:03 p.m.

STATE OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Pursuant to the Sunshine Law, a notice of this meeting's date, time, place, and agenda was sent to the news media, posted on the Township bulletin board, and filed with the Municipal Clerk.

ROLL CALL

Members: L. Geevers, C. Hoberman, M. Huey, A. Mandel, H. Marathe, S. Pankove, M. Karp, G. O'Brien,
Absent: Appelget, Baig, Schechel

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion to approve the Minutes of the May 16, 2018 was made by Mr. Huey, and seconded by Ms. Geevers. Voice Vote was taken; All approved. Mr. Pankove and Mr. Hoberman abstained.

Motion to approve the May 9, 2018 minutes as amended was made by Mayor Marathe, and seconded by Ms. Geevers. Voice Vote was taken; All approved. Mr. Pankove abstained.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPLICATION

Continuation of the PB17-08 WOODSTONE@WESTWINDSOR – Preliminary/Final Major Site Plan; Minor Subdivision, Wheeler Way and Canal Pointe Boulevard, Block 7, Lot 61.01; Block 7.02, Lot 1; Property Zoned: R-5A District; MLUL: June 15, 2018

Representation: Henry Kent-Smith, Attorney for the Applicant; Steven Santola, Woodmont Properties/Partner in Woodstone at West Windsor, LLC.; Greg Domalewski, P.E., MidAtlantic Engineering Partners; Victor Barr, AIA, VLBJR+ Architect; Nathan Mosley, Traffic Engineer, Shropshire Associates, LLC.

Mr. Kent-Smith reviewed the testimony given at the May 9th Planning Board Meeting. He introduced Mr. Nathan Mosley, Traffic Engineer for the applicant from Shropshire Associates, LLC.

Mr. Muller swore in Mr. Mosley. Mr. Wosley reviewed his background for the Planning Board. There were no objectives for this witness from the Planning Board.

Mr. Pankove advised that he has listened to the recording of the May 9th, 2018 Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Kent-Smith requested that Mr. Mosley review his May 23, 2018 Traffic Report for the Board.

Mr. Mosley reviewed for the Board Exhibit A-2 which shows the current roadway conditions and configurations. He reviewed the current traffic lights, stop intersections and advised that traffic counts have been conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and again between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Kent-Smith requested that Mr. Mosley review Exhibit A-5 for the Board members.

Mr. Mosley reviewed Exhibit A-5 which shows the entire site rendering proposed. He explained that they will be eliminating Farber Road and extending Loetscher Place to the existing light at Meadow Road and Canal Pointe Blvd. He noted that at the intersection of Wheeler Way and Emmons Drive there will be a four way stop temporarily. Mr. Mosley advised that all ADA requirements and appropriate lighting under State regulations will be done.

Ms. Mandel inquired when the traffic counts were conducted.

Mr. Mosley advised they were done prior to the repaving/road diet on Canal Pointe Boulevard. He reviewed the traffic patterns for this area and the proposed signalization at the intersection. He reviewed Exhibit A-27 Concept Roadway Improvement Plan which includes a new right turn lane onto Meadow Road from Wheeler Way.

Mr. Hoberman inquired if a LED left-turn signal from Loetscher Place is being installed.

Mr. Mosley reviewed the changes proposed for the intersection at this time. He advised that by switching the stop signs at the intersection of Emmons Drive and Wheeler Way this should significantly improve traffic flow in the area. Mr. Mosley advised that this change in the intersection will be a four way stop temporarily and then after review the stop signs for Wheeler Way will be removed. He advised that prior to this being done he will review the findings with the Township.

Mr. Kent Smith inquired what if there are issues with this intersection.

Mr. Mosley advised that they will look to construct a roadway for an island with yield control vs. stop sign control if necessary.

Chairman O'Brien advised that in Mr. Mosley's June 5th memorandum notes that the Township would have to obtain the right-of-way if needed.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised that they have no right to take private roadway for developer improvements and reviewed the process.

Mr. Surtees advised that the Princeton Theological Seminary owns this property currently.

Mr. Herman Martinez, Director of Facilities and Maintenance for Princeton Theological Seminary and Mr. Sam Surtees, Land Use Manager for the Township, were sworn in by Mr. Muller.

Mr. Martinez advised that this property is not owned by the Seminary.

Mr. Surtees advised that the formal name is Off-Site Tract Improvement Program. He reviewed the process for the Board members.

Mr. Muller swore in Mr. Francis Guzik, Township Engineer, Mr. Jepson, and Mr. Burgis.

Mr. Guzik reviewed the Off-Tract Improvement program and advised there are other funds within this program that, if needed for this intersection, could be used.

Mr. Hoberman inquired if this is a condition of the approval process.

Mr. Muller advised it is always a condition.

Mr. Pankove suggested that the applicant contact the Township Police to get current traffic ticket and accident report data for this area.

Mr. Kent-Smith asked Mr. Mosley to describe Exhibit A-28 Parking Exhibit.

Mr. Mosley advised that Exhibit A-28 Parking Exhibit (last page of booklet) shows 793 parking spaces which gives approximately 1.8 parking spaces per unit for the 443 units. This does not include the proposed bank parking.

Ms. Mandel inquired how many of these spots are garages.

Mr. Mosley advised that 163 garage spaces will be available. He reviewed the parking per building throughout the site and where the available bank parking will be located.

Mr. Kent-Smith inquired about the parallel parking spaces on Emmons Drive.

Mr. Mosley reviewed the 25 parallel parking spaces along Emmons Drive. He advised these spots are going to help with overflow parking needs for buildings 1 and 2. He noted that six spots could be removed if required by the Board.

Mr. Kent-Smith noted for the record his June 5, 2018 report reviews the parallel parking and the turning templates used for this project.

Mr. Mosley advised there is no bank parking along Emmons Drive for buildings 1 and 2 and wants to preserve these spaces for future use of these building areas. He advised that all turning templates for traffic are amenable.

Mr. Kent-Smith asked Mr. Mosley to review their parking management plan referred to in his June 5, 2018 report to the Board.

Mr. Mosley advised that they feel sufficient parking has been planned for the development. He noted that at three points throughout the project they will be reviewing the parking at the time four buildings have been constructed; when eight buildings have been constructed, and upon the completion of all 12 buildings. These findings will be submitted to the Township and if there is a need additional parking will be constructed from the bank parking areas. Mr. Mosley advised that the Township professionals have agreed with their proposal.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised that Exhibit A-29 is an e-mail received from Mr. Kochenour.

Chair O'Brien requested clarification on the e-mail between Mr. Kochenour and Mr. Guzik.

Mr. Guzik advised that his comments were to the initial draft of the memorandum, but based on the final memorandum as distributed he is in agreement with the June 5, 2018 memorandum from Mr. Mosley.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised that the conditions included in the June 5, 2018 memorandum from Mr. Mosley of Shropshire Associates should be included in the Developers Agreement.

Chair O'Brien requested that per Mr. Kochenour's May 18th memorandum that Mr. Mosley confirm the location of the 60 banked parking spaces for the Princeton Theological Seminary.

Mr. Mosley reviewed the plans of the Princeton Theological Seminary Exhibit A-30 Seminary Site Layout dated 7/2009; and Exhibit A-31 Site Layout Sheet #6 dated 7/2009. There are 50 spaces that have not been built to date.

Mr. Surtees advised that the Seminary provides a yearly report to the Township on utilization of their parking needs.

Mr. Hoberman inquired about the shared parking spaces along Loetscher Place and if they are striped.

Mr. Mosley advised that by having striped parking spaces it designates the parking for better utilization.

Board members addressed several questions to Mr. Mosley and Mr. Kent-Smith regarding parking for the site for current and future uses and they responded to the various questions/concerns.

Mr. Guzik inquired if the parking spaces along Loetscher Place are common.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised that the parking spaces along Loetscher Place are common to both developments.

Mayor Marathe inquired if the developer will be providing bus service to the Princeton Junction Train Station for this development.

Mr. Santola advised that they have not reviewed this for this site, but have done this in other sites they manage.

Ms. Geevers inquired if you limit parking per unit.

Mr. Santola advised that there is two spaces maximum per unit in their leases.

Ms. Geevers inquired where the school bus stops are.

Mr. Kent-Smith reviewed the current two bus stops that exist in this area and noted that the School District has requested two additional stops.

Mr. Burgis advised he has one question regarding Mr. Mosley's testimony and parking plan: Are you able to link in the occupancy of the units when doing your parking studies?

Mr. Mosley advised that he will be coordinating the number of parking with regard to the number of units rented as well as the number of bedrooms.

Mr. Burgis inquired about the breakdown of affordable units for the property.

Mr. Santola advised that they will follow the affordable housing regulations for the breakdown.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised they follow the UCRAC regulations. He advised that of the 89 affordable units 12 will be very low; 32 will be low; and 45 will be moderate and the bedroom distribution is as follows: Eighteen – 3 bedroom (8 low/10 moderate); fifty-four – 2 bedroom (27 low/27 moderate); seventeen- 1 bedroom (9 low/8 moderate). Completion schedule 25% at 111 – 22 affordable units; 50% 220 - 45 affordable units; 75% 332 - 67 affordable units completed; and 90% 400 - 89 total affordable units. He advised that all units have affordable units within them which Exhibit A-26 matrix shows the types of each affordable unit within the various buildings.

Mr. Burgis inquired about the refuse collection area being only in one location.

Mr. Santola introduced Exhibit A-32 Refuse Collection to the record. He reviewed the process for garbage collection and that valet service will be available for a mandatory fee for collection each day for garbage and recycling. Mr. Santola advised that affordable units are exempt from all amenity fees.

Mr. Burgis advised that everything else in his report from last month's meeting have been addressed and he is satisfied with the applicant's responses.

Mr. Huey inquired about the number of monument signs for the development.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised that the sign details are available on pages 26-32 of the plans submitted to the board.

Review of the monument signage to include landscaping was reviewed between the applicant and the Board.

Chair O'Brien asked why the seminary was not also included on the proposed signs, since the same two access roads also serve the seminary as well as the proposed project.

Mr. Muller swore in Mr. John Gilmore, Senior Vice President/CFO Princeton Theological Seminary.

Mr. Gilmore advised that the Seminary and Mr. Santola can work the signage out between the two parties. However, the seminary does not need to be included on the proposed signs.

Mr. Guzik reviewed his March 19, 2018 memorandum and advised that testimony at the May 9th and today's meeting have addressed most of his concerns with the exception of the following:

Section 1; page 4 – Minor Subdivision aspect need to have access to utility easements – need to be approved by Mr. Muller and Mr. Guzik.

Mr. Guzik advised that his office will assign the new block and lot number.

Section 2.01 – typo removal of Emmons Drive should be Farber Road. Issue is that the portion of Farber Road that needs to be removed there are easements that will need to be vacated and new easements will be needed for utility access for the township.

Comments 2-3-4 no objections already discussed.

Section 1 – a – for club house how it's going to be used by management staff, parking for staff, versus resident parking.

Mr. Santola advised that minimum of two and maximum of four on weekends personnel will be on site; but it's a static number.

Mr. Guzik (c) Loetscher Place stalls continue to count parking moving forward that these 33 stalls should be accounted for.

Mr. Kent-Smith said this will be memorialized.

Mr. Guzik reviewed his calculations for parking stalls, which includes the bank parking, plus the 33 on Loetscher Place that a total amount of 904 which exceeds the RSIS of 896 spaces.

3.04 – speed tables for buildings 4 and 5 and could they also be placed in front of buildings 10 and 12.

Applicant advised they are there.

3.07 Request for Title 39 Traffic Enforcement requires Princeton Theological Seminary to submit request to Township.

Chair O'Brien asked if you recommend Title 39 as a condition.

Mr. Santola said this should not be an issue.

Mr. Kent-Smith will work with West Windsor Police Department for Title 39 approval.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised that in the final plans to be submitted to the Township all bicycle parking/storage will be marked for each building as requested.

Mr. Guzik advised that in Mr. Mosley June 5, 2018 report that some of the improvements should be credited to their Off-Tract Assessment Program. He advised that he and Jim Kochenour agree that since the development touches this intersection they have to do these improvements per DOT Standards.

Mr. Mosley reviewed the proposed changes and why they feel the need for the right-turn lane is not necessary at this location because of their development. He noted that is why he indicated it should be a credit to their Off-Tract Improvement contribution.

Mr. Muller noted it should be paid for by the applicant according to Mr. Kochenour's recommendations.

Mr. Guzik Section 4 Storm Water; Section 4.01 Impervious – marked Exhibit PB-1 shows exhibits from Princeton Terrace using both impervious and pervious surfaces together. He reviewed the advantages to using this type of materials in a project. Mr. Guzik advised that better reasons for this waiver should be submitted by the applicant and not just for maintenance reasons.

Discussion ensued as to what could be used and how the developer feels they are addressing the issue of pervious vs. impervious sidewalks, walkways, and driveways throughout the development.

Mr. Dobromilsky noted this was also brought-up in his report and that he agrees with Mr. Guzik's concerns about the pervious versus impervious. He addressed his concerns with garages and parking along the units making them feel more residential versus industrial.

Mr. Kent-Smith reviewed Mr. Guzik's testimony and noted that under the Township's current ordinances this is not required.

Mr. Santola advised he agrees with his attorney they will not entertain this suggestion.

Mr. Kent-Smith noted for the record that they will do a previous treatment for buildings (3, 4, 5, and 6) that have garages.

Mr. Muller inquired if the area around the pool will be pervious.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised that this area will be pervious.

Mr. Guzik Section 4.02 Operation and Maintenance Manual – condition of approval; requires stormwater easement/deed restrictions as a condition; 4.03 per ordinance 200-105.1 requires an agreement with the Township in form satisfactory with Mr. Muller as Planning Board Attorney, requiring the installation and maintenance by the applicant and all their successors for such stormwater management improvements proposed by the applicant and agreed to by the Board as a condition of this application.

Section 5.0 Street Lighting; 5.01 – appropriate shielding for all lighting; 5.02-5.03 no objections to these requested waivers; 5.04 lighting plan for the pool area has to be provided for review 30 days prior to construction of pool as a condition of approval; 6.01 existing drainage line is to be cleaned and televised by the applicant prior to construction of the proposed improvements and any defects found are to be corrected prior to the introduction of flows into the system. Any at-grade features (street lights, sidewalks, landscaping, etc.) that are installed by the developer are at their own risk and the township will not be responsible to repair or replace within easements. 6.02 for sewer laterals from demolished buildings the applicant is required to televise the sewer mains and plug each abandoned lateral connection at the main as a condition of approval. 6.03 Applicant has to request reservation for wastewater flows in municipal collection system and authorization for execution of the required NJDEP Treatment Works Approval permit applicants for extension of the collection system which will require Township Council approval. This should be a condition of approval. 6.04 applicant is required to participate in the D&R Canal Sewer Interceptor District in accordance with ordinance 200-89 and a payment towards reimbursement to downstream developers is required. This should be a condition of approval.

7.01 typo in description should be 44.617 acres not 44.671 acres other than that acceptable. 7-02 the applicant is to submit Engineer's construction costs estimates for review and will be required to post performance guarantees and inspection fees for both on and off site improvements in accordance with MLUL and Township ordinance. This should be a condition of approval. 7.03 as per ordinance 200-81.1 applicant is required to provide via both hard copy and electronic format approved plans being submitted for signature and as-built surveys upon project completion should project be approved and constructed. In addition a PDF copy of the Stormwater Management Report, Stormwater Operation and Maintenance Manual and all related mapping once same are approved by the Engineering Office should be submitted. This should be a condition of approval. 7.04 Additional approvals are needed from Mercer County Planning Board, Mercer County Soil Conservation District; Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission; and NJDEP (TWA permit) all as a condition of approval.

Mr. Chris Jepson Environmental Consultant, needs D&R Permit; addressed his concerns about the detention basin size; pervious surfaces should be used; need more solar energy.

Mr. Santola advised that conduit was agreed to for possible future panels on the roof.

Mr. Kent-Smith advised that the conduit will be put in place for future use of solar when panels are more appropriate for their development.

Ms. Geevers inquired about electric charging stations for cars.

Mr. Santola advised they will be looking into charging stations for the site.

Mr. Dobromilsky noted his report is dated March 13, 2018. #1 they will be removing trees from the greenbelt where it is not desirable it is not intrusive into the greenbelt; #2 they will need to remove 120 trees not feasible to save; #3 testimony he gave during Mr. Guzik's report; #4 requirements for open space and recreational space he reviewed SPRAB discussions he is not overly concerned about these spaces.

Chair O'Brien inquired if a provision could be placed as a condition of approval if need to expand.

Mr. Santola advised they could do this, however they are trying to limit their kid friendly amenities. He noted it would be incumbent upon the developer if the residents want/need additional recreation.

Chair O'Brien referenced memorandum from the Affordable Housing Committee who addressed concerns about recreation amenities. He advised that they will leave additional recreation amenities to the developer.

Mr. Dobromilsky 5a waivers will be required for design/graded form, and planting quantities are still required as a condition of approval; 5b design waivers are necessary for a substandard window wall to window wall offset between buildings; applicant needs to indicate where substandard offsets and how landscape design or other measures will help mitigate these deficiencies.; 5c as plans are finalized locations of light poles, utility meters, control panels and similar elements should be shown on the landscape plans to enable appropriate adjustments to avoid conflicts and/or provide screening; 6 applicant should describe the extent and type of proposed site furnishings such as benches, bike racks,

etc. and comprehensive construction details for all recreation improvements must be included on final site plan set. He suggested using black chain link fence for aesthetic purposes near proposed building 1.

Mr. Kent-Smith agreed to this change.

Chair O'Brien advised that this application will be continued to June 13, 2018 at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting was adjourned by Chair O'Brien at 10:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gay M. Huber