

**CITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK
PLANNING BOARD
APRIL 8TH 2019
MINUTES**

MEETING LOCATION:
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY HALL, TOP FLOOR
78 BAYARD STREET
7:30 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

√	Jeff Crum (Chairperson)
	John Petrolino
√	Robert Cartica
√	Manuel Castaneda
√	Clary Barber (Class I)
	Chris Stelatella (Class II)
√	Suzanne Sicora-Ludwig (Class III)
√	Dale Vickers (Alternate #1)
√	Yelitssa Checo (Alternate #2)

II. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT (OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT)

III. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

IV. MINUTES OF THE BOARDS January 14th 2019 MEETING

Motion to Carry for Amendments: Cartica

Second: Barber

Approved by unanimous voice vote

√	Jeff Crum (Chairperson)
	John Petrolino
√	Robert Cartica

√	Manuel Castaneda
	Clary Barber (Class I)
	Chris Stelatella (Class II)
√	Suzanne Sicora-Ludwig (Class III)
√	Dale Vickers (Alternate #1)
√	Yelitssa Checo (Alternate #2)

MINUTES OF THE BOARDS February 11th, 2019 MEETING

Motion to Carry for Amendments: Castaneda

Second: Sicora-Ludwig

Approved by unanimous voice vote

	Jeff Crum (Chairperson)
	John Petrolino
√	Robert Cartica
√	Manuel Castaneda
	Clary Barber (Class I)
	Chris Stelatella (Class II)
√	Suzanne Sicora-Ludwig (Class III)
√	Dale Vickers (Alternate #1)
√	Yelitssa Checo (Alternate #2)

New Business

- A. **501 Jersey Ave PB-2018-09**, Site plan and variance application for the construction of a warehouse to be located at 501 Jersey Ave, Block 596, Lot 7.02, 7.03, Zoning District I-2

Peter Vigunulo:

Presented Preliminary and Final Site Plan for a warehouse on a previous chemical manufacturing site. The site is deteriorating and non-conforming with the setback requirements. The Building is currently an eyesore with frontage on Jersey and Van Dyke Ave. Applicant will provide significant screening with proposed warehouse building and the AJA park. Applicant has asked for a

variance for building coverage variance. Zoning permits 35% and the applicant proposes 45%. Applicant is providing enough parking. Applicant is also asking for a variance for the provision of trees and a waiver for ground plantings with a tree fund for the trees. This is because the ground plantings are not fitting with the foundation of the plantings. The Bignell Planning Report recommends the waiver. There are two witnesses here today, Mr. Sewald, engineer and planner Mr. Taylor, traffic engineer. The Applicant has agreed to comply with all reports.

Josh Sewald, Licensed Engineer:

Oversaw design for the site. There are dual frontages on Van Dyke and Jersey Ave. There is an office building on one side and on all other sides there are warehouses except towards the AJA Park. The site is approximately 200k square feet. The Applicant proposes a warehouse, which is a permitted use in the I-2 zone with 56 loading docks, 116 parking spaces that follow the city's ordinance. Within that square footage will be about 10,000 square feet of warehouse and service. The driveways will only be provided on Jersey Ave, none to be provided on Van Dyke Ave. The southern most driveway will be restricted as per the county's request and a condition of approval. The other driveway, north, is where we anticipate our trucks to be entering the site.

Applicant complies with almost all bulk variances. Except for trees and build coverage. Overall a 200k site with three deviations. All utilities will come from Jersey Ave. All LED lighting complies with light and illumination standards. The street trees will be placed at every 50 feet. The Applicant will include 380 new plantings. A majority of which are on street frontages where they should be. There are three agencies involved including D&R canal who we are pending with them and should get an approval shortly, Freehold Soil, and the Middlesex County Planning Board.

Is the Applicant proposing a signage?

Yes. The Applicant will comply with the sign ordinance as is.

Did you have any opportunity to review all items on your Bignell report?

Yes. Will provide all items of Bignell planning report.

Property is from 1930s. when you sell a property that was manufacturing you must go through rigorous environmental review as per the New Jersey state law. You must also go through a preliminary assessment.

Bob Cartica:

Couldn't review environmental documents. Weren't provided this. Please explain.

Vignuolo:

(Explains) The sale triggered the act. And thus, an investigation began which led to remediation which is currently ongoing.

Bletcher:

(Asks about depth and LSRP)

Sewald:

Yes, and you will be providing the city with a copy of the remedial action outcome as part of your submission.

Vignuolo:

Yes. No RA on it yet.

Sewald:

Is the RA required?

Vignuolo:

Yes, to make sure that every AOC is cleared.

Sewald

There will be on going monitoring after construction, as well as on going DEP monitoring.

Did you have a chance to review the engineering review?

Sewald:

Yes. We can meet all conditions of the engineering review.

Variance for trees:

Sewald:

The Site is on an industrial property. Street trees will be provided on Van Dyke and Jersey Ave. This will include a good landscaping plan with 380 plantings and a brand-new modern warehouse.

Waiver for foundation plantings:

These are more suitable for residential and commercial. Not between the building and the parking area.

Building coverage:

The Maximum coverage allowed by the ordinance is 35% and we are proposing 44.4%.

Therefore, we are seeking a C2 relief.

We comply with all other standards, front, side and rear yard.

As well as the 85% impervious coverage that is allowed and that we are compliance with.

The FAR is 1.0 meaning we can development 100% or go up multiple stories. We are only using .44 of your FAR. Meaning that we can either double or make the building three times larger.

This is creating a better planning criterion which can be justified by the Negative criteria.

This is because the plan is creating a more intense coverage, but with less intense use.

The Zoning Ordinance as it is allowing for more development.

In doing so, we are also removing 3 non-conforming variances from the existing buildings.

In addition, there is no significant detriment with the requested variances to public good or the zoning ordinance.

Crum:

The current use is a chemical manufacturing plant?

Sewald:

In its prime it was chemical manufacturing facility which then shipped to other sites.

Crum:

Regarding the Tree Variance, Are you in compliance?

Sewald:

The ordinance requires 28 trees and we are providing 26, but we are happy to provide the 28 trees. We are also moving 72 trees on the site.

Todd:

We are also placing a 12-foot area buffer behind the warehouse because as it is there is not enough space from the ballfield. We will also plant those trees on the park side and give them to the Board of Education. We will also provide approval from the Board of Education to do so. Therefore, we will provide a more significant screening buffer. This is substantial way to make up for the deficit. At the end of the day they will provide a calculation if they owe us any outstanding trees beyond that.

Cartica:

Why should the board support the bulk variance?

Sewald:

The reason is because the buildings as is are scattered and in several three existing nonconforming variances. The project is only in violation of the 35% building coverage. This building is less intense than what was and will provide fewer traffic trips than what is currently there when it was active. It is also an architecturally pleasing building with modernistic warehouse appearance.

Vig:

If you exceed building coverage you usually run afoul of other variances, but not on this project.

Sewald:

We will also provide major improvements, including new utilities, and stormwater management. What we are proposing is less intense and there is no detriment to the road. In fact, this will actually reduce traffic. The appearance composed of white grey walls with a blue trim. It will look like a modern warehouse facility with major planning benefits as shown.

There are no negative/ detriments to the landscape plan associated with the square footage?

Correct because we comply with impervious coverage allowable. In my opinion, the way that the ordinance is written it allows for 85% coverage and to come out to 55 feet of the roadway. Overall it is a major improvement to the site and the surrounding, including less water going into the road.

Justin Taylor, Traffic Engineer:

Familiar with traffic study. Reviewed surrounding road network and site circulation. Conducted traffic counts of Van Dyke and Jersey. Physically observed that traffic generated starts at 50-60 cars per peak hour. LOS C. Vehicles will safely enter and exit the site with minimal delays. Van Dyke and Jersey Ave is a busy intersection, and we will only anticipate 20 more cars during peak hours.

The existing site would generate 80 cars per peak hour if live. The parking requirement is met with respect to the parking ordinance. The ordinance asks for 100 parking spaces, and 10 loading spots, and we are providing 56 loading spots. Therefore, we exceed parking spaces and loading spaces. There will be two driveways on Jersey Ave. The North East driveway will be used by trucks. Cars will use the center driveway. The Separation of driveways improves circulation. Therefore, we do not see a detriment to the road way.

Carley's review.

The first requirement was to provide a Warrant analysis, which we are willing to complete. The Peak hour traffic is mostly from employees. Truck traffic will be driving in opposite downtown. 50% of cars will go into downtown towards north. Therefore, we will direct all truck traffic south.

What about the fact there is not enough clearance under NJ TRANSIT North East Corridor?

Most of our trucks will be a maximum of 13' 5", a majority of them are around 12'. But we do not really anticipate our trucks needing to go through there.

I would suggest that all your tractor trailers be directed to the south as well, because the clearances are closer to 12'.

I don't think we will have an issue there.

Crum:

Middlesex County recommends only right turns outward.

Cartica:

Does the recommendation include that all trucks will only go south?

Taylor:

Yes

Is there any signage in the plan?

There will be Signage at the truck driveway, northern driveway.

Carley:

Would this make the left turn uncomfortable.?

Taylor:

Yes

Cartica:

Did the analysis incorporate the warehouse across the street?

Taylor:

I do not believe that we took that directly into account. The NJDOT background growth rate was considered. Therefore, it shouldn't be an issue. With regarding the 30 to 40 cars in the driveway, I do not see that changing much even when the driveway changes.

Cartica:

I drive this path every day and it's a problem. Cars are always backed up on Van Dyke every day. I always have to go around cars and trucks going into New Brunswick at 5pm. Just seems like it would add to the chaos.

Taylor:

However, this plan would reduce traffic vs existing site.

Carley:

The warrant analysis will most likely require a signal on this site. Will likely need to be signalized in the future for school crossing concerns.

Cartica:

Will there be potential employment opportunities for city residents?

Sewald:

End user will likely provide many jobs to city residents for drivers and office workers. Therefore, this will likely improve existing employment opportunities.

Todd:

If warrant analysis says you need to build a traffic light. Does your client agree to pay for their cut?

Sewald:

County wants a signal there. However, there are three agencies on this site which causes a bureaucracy problem. NJDOT, Middlesex County, and the City. No agency wants to take control. I don't want to say no, but it would be difficult to justify what our fair share of the project is, but we may be willing to make a small contribution.

Sewald:

The Assessment would be better and fairer. In addition, a Special Assessment would collect a better fee to develop the signalization.

Aravind:

Maybe have the Board consider flexibility based on contribution or the assessment?

Carley:

The project.

Crum:

Who makes this decision?

Carley:
The City of New Brunswick

Crum: I would rather let the special assessment decide.

I don't think you have the power to do so.

Crum:
Condition- a traffic warrant analysis is required, and the applicant is aware that they may have to eventually pay a contribution or assessment to this signalization in the future.

Cartica:
Concerned of cumulative buildup of traffic on this corridor. Even though the project is consistent with the zoning. We will not know the actual traffic impact until it happens, and the traffic starts to build up at these intersections and becomes someone else's problem.

Taylor:
From a warehouse use perspective, we are one of the lower trip generator, this is a low traffic generator. A warehouse is one of the lower generators permitted in the I-2. A large office building may have done a lot more to intensify traffic.

Right, I understand that if this were a WAWA it would be a lot worse.

Suzanne:
This project is consistent with the city's master plan.

Cartica:
As a DEP employee, Will this be conflict of interest with me?

Aravind:
No.

Crum:
Positive for me is that for a site near a school is being remediated and the better screening that will be provided. Important from an environmental justice perspective and enhancement for the community overall. Applicant is here for vote and resolution.

Public:

None.

Todd:

Reads conditions. DNR EGNINERRING REPORT. ESCROW FEES. BIGNELL PLANNING REPORT. TREE PRESERVATION TRUST FUND. SOIL CONSERVATION. SUBMISSION OF REMEDIATION REPORT SUBMITTED BY LSRP. SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FOR TRAFFIC STUDY. ONSITE UTILITIES TO BE PROVIDED UNDERGROUND. STREET TO BE KEPT CLEAN OF SEDIMENT AND DEBRI. VARIANCE FOR BUILDING COVERAGE. ETC

Aravind:

Generic request for approval from all powers involved.

Both lots on site be merged.

Acknowledgment wt.

1st Sicora

2nd Manny

√	Jeff Crum (Chairperson)
	John Petrolino
√	Robert Cartica
√	Manuel Castaneda
√	Clary Barber (Class I)
	Chris Stellatella (Class II)
√	Suzanne Sicora-Ludwig (Class III)
√	Dale Vickers (Alternate #1)
√	Yelitssa Checo (Alternate #2)

Res:

1st: Sicora

2nd: Barber

√	Jeff Crum (Chairperson)
	John Petrolino
√	Robert Cartica
√	Manuel Castaneda

√	Clary Barber (Class I)
	Chris Stelatella (Class II)
√	Suzanne Sicora-Ludwig (Class III)
√	Dale Vickers (Alternate #1)
√	Yelitssa Checo (Alternate #2)

VII. OTHER MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE PUBLIC

None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT