

MINUTES OF THE
EAST BRUNSWICK TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD

August 23, 2023

STATEMENT - Open Public Meetings Act

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL -

PRESENT:

Charles Heppel, Chairman
Brad Cohen, Mayor
Muhammad Hashmi
Kevin McEvoy
Joseph Criscuolo
Steve Philips
Adam Neary
Mary Pan
Prashasth Turaga, Student Rep.

ABSENT:

Shawn Taylor
Laurence Reiss
Erum Shakir

ALSO PRESENT:

Lawrence Kroll, Esquire
Lou Ploskonka - Planner
Kevin Chen - Engineer
Ron Reinertsen
Aaron Blessing - Zoning Officer
Jessica Tegeder - Secretary

NEW BUSINESS

Application #23-11 - Joanna Court Realty, Inc. - Proposed one-story 113,570-square-foot addition to an existing one-story 208,108-square-foot warehouse (321,678 total) and additional associated parking, drainage, and landscaping site improvements located at 6 Joanna Court, block 31.02, lot 6, in the IM zone. Mandatory date August 24, 2023. Motion to approve by Mr. Hashmi, second by Mr. McEvoy. Application approved with conditions.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Philips, second by Mr. Hashmi. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, everyone. This is the East Brunswick Township -- this is the August 23, 2023, East Brunswick Township Planning Board meeting. In accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law, on May 4, 2023, notice of this meeting stating the time, date, and location was sent to the Home News Tribune and the Asbury Park Press, filed with the township clerk, and posted on the bulletin board in the lobby of the municipal building. A copy of this notice will be incorporated in the minutes of this meeting.

The chair reserves the right to call any application in an order different from that appearing on the agenda. On each application, the chair will give the public an opportunity to comment. You can be assured I won't change the order of the applications tonight.

The planning board will entertain no new business after 9:30 p.m. and will close all proceedings at 10 p.m.

The doors outside the courtroom are the exits to be used in case of emergency.

Before we rise to do the pledge of allegiance, I ask that after we stand if we complete -- if we could all stand and give a moment of silence for Jo Ann Magistro. She was our superintendent of schools. She was with us for 42 years. She worked her way right, you know, right through the system, vice principal, principal of schools, first principal of a high school -- female principal -- and I knew her for a long time. I know a number of us do. I know former Mayor McEvoy did, and I'm sure Mayor Cohen knows her. She was an absolutely great person and someone that we all liked and respected very, very much. So after we pledge allegiance if we can just have that moment of silence, okay?

(Flag salute)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. Our first -- well, our only application for this evening is --

MS. TEGEDER: Charlie, roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: The roll call first, okay. We don't want to skip that. I know we're all in a rush to go see the Yankees. They won't have

any hits by the time we get home anyway.

MS. TEGEDER: Take my time? Prashasth.

MR. TURAGA: Here.

MS. TEGEDER: Mrs. Pan.

MS. PAN: Here.

MS. TEGEDER: Mrs. Shakir. Mr. Neary.

MR. NEARY: Here.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Here.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. Reiss. Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Here.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. McEvoy.

MR. MCEVOY: Here.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Here.

MS. TEGEDER: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Here.

MS. TEGEDER: And Chairman Heppel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Here.

Okay, application -- first application is application 23-11, Joanna Court Realty, Incorporated, proposal of a one-story 113,570-square-foot addition to the existing one-story 208,108-square-foot warehouse totaling 321,678 square feet and additional associated parking, drainage, and landscaping site improvements, located at 6 Joanna Court, block 31.01, lot 6, in the IM zone.

You're here to represent them, correct?

MR. VITIELLO: Yes, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. Thank you for having us here tonight. For the record, my name is Michael Vitiello. I'm an attorney licensed in the State of New Jersey. I am here representing Joanna Court. Mr. Chairman stole my very brief introduction, so that was all I had to start us off.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Excuse me one second, okay. You're welcome to have a seat over here.

MR. VITIELLO: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I didn't catch your last name.

MR. VITIELLO: Vitiello, V-i-t-i-e-l-l-o.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Kroll, is this application --

MR. KROLL: Jurisdiction is proper.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. I'm sorry.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you. Thank you.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is my introduction, members of the board. We are proposing an addition to an existing warehouse on Joanna Court. The warehouse has a company that rents the space, but the company is related to the company that owns the land. So basically, it's owner occupied. The company that's there stores paper files, like bank files, law firm files, accounting files, for third parties like Iron Mountain. They're not much smaller than Iron Mountain. They have facilities all over, not just the east coast, but some on the west coast and things like that. So they're here today for a proposal to expand. They need the extra space.

With me tonight to testify on this matter I have our civil engineer, and I have our traffic expert, both here proposed for direct testimony. Our civil engineer is also a planner who will be able to comment on the planning aspects of the application.

We've reviewed the municipal reports. We've had a pre-meeting, a workshop meeting, with your board consultants. It was very helpful, very informative. We appreciate that. So if it pleases the board, we can start swearing my witnesses or my first witness.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sounds good.

MR. VITIELLO: Would you like to just swear the first witness, or would you like to do both?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, one at a time.

MR. VITIELLO: One at a time, okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. PROCANIK: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Please give us your name, first name, last name, spell your last name, and a little bit of your CV, please.

MR. PROCANIK: Sure. My name is Richard Procanik. It's P-r-o-c-a-n-i-k. I'm a senior project manager at Colliers Engineering & Design. Our business address is 53 Frontage Road, Suite 110, in Hampton, New Jersey. I am a licensed engineer in the State of New Jersey as well as other states in the surrounding area. I obtained my Bachelor's of Science from NJIT. I also hold a planning license in the State of New Jersey. I have not yet appeared in front of this board, but I have appeared approximately 120 times throughout the state --

THE CHAIRMAN: We're glad to accept you.

MR. PROCANIK: Thank you so much.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Procanik, the plans that were submitted as part of our site plan application, they were prepared by you or others under your direction and control?

MR. PROCANIK: I inherited this project from another engineer. You'll see Mr. Caballero's name in the signature block, but I have taken responsible control. I have reviewed the documents, and I am comfortable speaking to them at any length tonight.

MR. VITIELLO: Good. So using the documents, using your exhibits that you have tonight, I'd like you to start by just simply describing for the board what exists on the site right now.

MR. PROCANIK: Before we get too far into that, I did bring boards, but I know we also provided digital copies. I just don't know how you would like to present.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Chairman, I received the exhibits from counsel office, put them on the projector at the moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. It's a lot easier that way.

(Inaudible)

MR. PROCANIK: And it's even better. My laser pointer works on the --

MR. BLESSING: Will we be starting with existing conditions?

MR. PROCANIK: If it's possible, the existing conditions. Yeah, that one, the aerial.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you.

MR. PROCANIK: So what is displayed on the projector is an aerial exhibit with our property outlined, our site identified, and then the surrounding road names overlaid on the aerial. It is dated August 23, 2023, as prepared by Colliers Engineering & Design. Do we need to mark this as an exhibit?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, mark it. A-1.

MR. PROCANIK: So the property highlighted on the projector is known as 6 Joanna Court, block 31.01, lot 6, and is located in the IM zone, industrial and manufacturing. The surrounding areas for the presentation are cardinal directions are north is up, the little north arrow right there, east right, south down, west left. North of us is

the same zone, IM, with the additional warehouses as part of the same industrial complex, center, however you like to describe it. To our south is a railroad. There's also the DPW yard, and then beyond that there is a residential community that's in the R-3 district. I'm sorry, DPW. On the other side? Yeah, I'm sorry, that's what I was trying to point to.

Now, to the west is the office industrial zone. It's the public works building. And warehouse beyond it. So our application tonight for our warehouse is relatively consistent with the immediately surrounding areas.

So the -- on our property is currently a 208 -- sorry -- 208,108-square-foot one-story concrete building, which has two driveways off of Joanna Court. The western driveway -- it's to the left -- has nine loading docks, no vehicle parking, and currently only two are being used by the current applicant. The second driveway is down towards the cul-de-sac. It's actually I think part of the bulb. And it is strictly for passenger vehicles and currently houses 100 parking spaces.

The current operation is -- has three full-time employees with GRM and an additional four employees that are temporary, so the maximum employees on the site at any one point in time will be seven.

Currently utilizing up to 10 parking spaces, and the normal hours of operation are 9 to 5.

If there's no question on the existing, could we go to the rendered.

THE CHAIRMAN: By the way, a lot of our members, you know, do go to the sites, so we're -- even though we live here, most of us for a very long time, many for their whole lifetimes -- when I was there the other day, there was a trailer there. There was a door open and no cars. So I thought, well, maybe you have a, you know, somebody comes in and checks on the building. But typically there are employees working there then.

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, at a minimum there's two full-time employees at any point in time, but from the tenant, themselves, they have three employees on staff full-time and four temporary employees.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good, thanks. Any questions from the board? No? Okay.

MR. VITIELLO: Switched exhibits now so

like to A-2 is acceptable for this exhibit?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. VITIELLO: So can you describe what we're marking as A-2.

MR. PROCANIK: Certainly. Can you just zoom out just a little bit. I just want to make sure I pronounce it exactly correctly. What we're looking at now is 6 Joanna Court site plan exhibit dated 8-23-23, prepared by Colliers Engineering & Design. This is a -- has the aerial, the existing aerial from Google Earth as a background, and it has the proposed site features overlaid, which are rendered, and those site features are parking lot, building, some landscaping, and stormwater areas, which I'll touch on very shortly.

The applicant is proposing an addition of 113,500 square feet, which is to the left or to the west of the building. That is shown in the tan hatch; the existing building, white hatch. The proposed addition has a setback of 71.2 from the front yard to Joanna, 112.2 from the rear yard -- from the front yard to Harts -- sorry -- 38.9 to the rear yard. That kind of doubles as a side yard along Harts, but that is a rear yard. And then 50.1 to the side yard a little bit further east on the site.

The overall project requires 65 parking spaces. We are providing 70 physical spaces. In addition, we do have two EV charging stations to be compliant with the state requirements. Those two spaces are not counted in those 70, so if you utilize the two-for-one credit, we would technically have 72 parking spaces.

MR. VITIELLO: And our EV spaces will not just be make-ready. We understand the municipality wants charging structures installed, and as someone who drives an electric car, I think that's a great idea. We will do that.

MR. PROCANIK: So just to kind of expand on the proposed conditions, there's a few pieces to this. I did mention the 113,000-square-foot addition. We are also proposing a new parking lot off of Harts Lane, which will have I believe that's 21 parking spaces. Yeah, 21 parking spaces. There's a driveway that's 24 feet wide. It's approximately 200 feet south of Joanna Court.

MR. PHILIPS: Just get a clarification. You have two separate parking lots that look like they're separated probably by 5 or 600 feet. Are you planning on putting one charging station at one

parking lot and another charging station at the other parking lot, or are they both going to be at the same parking lot?

MR. PROCANIK: Our proposal right now is to have two charging stations in that easterly parking lot.

MR. PHILIPS: Okay.

MR. PROCANIK: If we kind of go further east on Joanna, you'll notice there is a driveway coming off of Joanna. It's one way, 30 feet wide, and intended to service a proposed loading dock on the north side of the building. We're proposing three loading docks. It is angled, a bit of a sawtooth, if you will, but there will be a canopy overhang along the front facade that shields most of that.

Moving even further east back to the cul-de-sac, we will be utilizing the existing driveway curb cut and reconfiguring the parking lot to better serve that existing building. As part of that, there are 49 proposed spaces, four loading -- we're adding four loading docks at the south of that area. We have a minimum setback of 21.2 where 10 is required by ordinance. And as I mentioned, those two EV spaces are going to be in the northeast corner right next to the ADA parking spaces. They will not be in the ADA spaces, just directly adjacent to them.

Also, in this easterly area -- we don't show it on this render, nor is it on the site plan documents provided, but we will provide a trash enclosure consistent with the ordinance.

If you look closely, you probably can't see them on this render, but this also does show wheel stops. We understand that that is not permitted within the township so we will remove those. We only had them against the sidewalk against the building, but we do provide a 5-foot sidewalk, which is adequate without the need for additional protection.

I would like to touch on stormwater briefly. In this ever changing time of climate change and shifts and intensity in rain, I think it's important for the board to understand at some level what we're proposing. So starting with the west, this passenger vehicle parking lot, that's all going to be porous pavement. So that is green infrastructure. So the water will land on the parking lot. It will infiltrate down through an engineered media where it's temporarily stored and

then will discharge into a bioretention basin that is on Harts and kind of wraps around a little bit on Joanna, and that bioretention is green infrastructure. So this is not your traditional stormwater basin that you see just a bunch of grass big hole in the ground. That's not what we're proposing. In nature it starts that way, but then again there's an engineered media at the bottom, and then there's certain requirements from the DEP for plantings, that the plantings -- it's typically estimated to be 85 percent vegetated by DEP standards, and that would equate to what they refer to as 1,000 stems per acre. So for every 1 acre, there's going to be 1,000 plants and shrubs and everything else. So that ends up being a tree every 12 feet and a shrub every 8 feet in a linear dimension.

To the north in this driveway for the loading docks, that will not be porous pavement because of the heavy loading of the vehicles, but we are implementing terra devices, and that is a manufactured green infrastructure device intended to again remove pollutants, TS -- suspended solids, and anything else that's not supposed to be in the ground -- in the runoff. That will ultimately discharge back into that same basin that is along Harts.

Similarly to the parking lot in the rear, where we are proposing passenger vehicle parking, again, porous pavement. It's going to go right through the pavement and then be treated and stored there. The main drive coming off of the cul-de-sac, that's just going to be your typical heavy-duty asphalt pavement, and all of this will ultimately discharge into this bioretention basin that separates the parking from I guess we would call it a drive aisle for the trucks.

There is also an existing stormwater management series of basins along the existing building, which we will not be touching, and they'll continue to serve the site and some off-site flow from the cul-de-sac.

Now kind of moving into some of the landscaping, so we do show some trees along Joanna, some trees along the back side of the parking lot in the east, and some trees along Harts Lane. Upon further review, we were talking with your municipal engineer -- your board engineer, and we are deficient in a few areas in counts of trees. So we will be compliant. We've worked with our landscape

architecture team. They can meet those requirements, and we will be compliant when we submit for resolution compliance.

One variance that we are asking for -- we had to get to the variance eventually -- is along Harts Lane. There is a requirement for front yard parking within the ordinance, and it identifies that any parking in a front yard requires a 20-foot landscaped buffer. Just due to -- we'll get into the planning testimony later, but the unique configuration of the lot, the parking, the bioretention, we don't have 20 feet left to buffer. We have approximately 10. Ten is on the low side. I think it's like 10.5, and it kind of expands out to somewhere around 11 feet. So we will buffer that area. It just would not meet the actual linear dimension of 20, but we'll overcompensate the best we can within that 10 feet to provide the same screening, the intent of the ordinance to provide screening along Harts.

THE CHAIRMAN: One second. Staff, is that okay with you?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If it serves the purposes from a planning standpoint -- the purpose is to shield and buffer the road. If they provide sufficient plantings, that should serve in the spirit of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. PROCANIK: Moving on to the general site lighting, we're proposing 10 poles and six wall packs. One of the comments in the CME letter did ask for us to provide some additional calculations to verify maximum and minimum ratios. We're happy to do so, and we'll include that in our resubmission, and we'll be fully compliant with the ordinance.

I did skip over one very important piece that I should have mentioned when I first started. There is a second variance for the new proposed warehouse in this southwest corner. We're proposing 38.9 feet where 40 is required for a rear yard. So it's 1.1. I would consider de minimus, but I do have some testimony for that at the planning part of it, as well.

MR. VITIELLO: Is it accurate if that was considered a side yard, that would be compliant; is that correct?

MR. PROCANIK: You're stealing my planning testimony. Yes, it is.

MR. VITIELLO: So if it's considered a

rear yard technically, technically it is a rear yard --

MR. PROCANIK: For 40 feet.

MR. VITIELLO: -- you have to comply with the rear yard standards, so we're a foot and a half, about a foot and a half short.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff, de minimus, you're okay with that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I mean, it's for the planning testimony, but they would just talk about the uniqueness of the site. This is a front -- it has two front yards. So in essence, they have this extra rear yard, you know, this other rear yard that they have to apply. So I'll defer to his planning testimony just to address, you know, just very briefly.

MR. PROCANIK: One other item that was mentioned in the CME letter that testimony was asked to be provided on was snow removal. We do have space available on site within the stormwater management areas. Along Harts there is a green space on the loading dock on Joanna. There's a bioretention on the rear, and then there's also some space between the curb and the property line on the east side. We believe that is adequate space to store snow. Happy to provide a plan for your board engineer's review should they deem it necessary, and in the unlikely case that there is too much snow, our client has committed to having a private hauler take it off site.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I'd like a plan.

MR. PROCANIK: Okay.

MR. PHILIPS: Charlie.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Steve.

MR. PHILIPS: Just going back to the EV parking.

MR. PROCANIK: Just so I understand it. If a person who works all the way in the western wing has an EV car, their obligation to is park all the way on the eastern wing and walk entirely through the building in order to get to the western wing office?

MR. VITIELLO: They don't have to use the EV space. It's a convenience item. There may be a charge. It may be too expensive for them. But it will be on the property. If all of that worked out, then that's where they would have to go unless there's two other people already parked there, the whole --

MR. PHILIPS: Okay, so just so I'm clear, it's a convenience, but it's not meant to

necessarily have somebody who works all the way on the left to be able to use it.

MR. VITIELLO: Well, the employees would work in the whole building. We don't have, like, employees that just work on one side of the building. They do cover the whole building. Part of the issue is the charging infrastructure that's installed is designed to serve two parking spaces. So the charging tower will serve two parking spaces. So it's difficult to break the two parking spaces in half, you know, to separate them.

MR. PHILIPS: There's two charging stations.

MR. VITIELLO: There's one -- there's two --

MR. PHILIPS: One charging station.

MR. VITIELLO: -- charging space. There's one charging tower --

MR. PHILIPS: One charging station, okay.

MR. VITIELLO: -- that provides wires to two spaces. So there's two spaces but one tower.

MR. PHILIPS: One tower, okay, and there was no interest at all in putting a tower on the other parking lot.

MR. VITIELLO: Well, they're fully compliant like this. They don't really envision having any of their employees or many of their guests really show up with electric vehicles, so they thought this was more than adequate.

MR. PROCANIK: And just to expand on that, we also -- it's intended for the employees of the building. We don't want to draw off-site traffic onto our site and utilize the parking allocated for us.

MR. PHILIPS: I don't think anybody would expect you to do that, but at the same time, the call is that by 2030, 2035, the number of electric vehicles is going to skyrocket, and so planning for what might be a snapshot taken in 2023 doesn't adequately consider what will be in 2028.

MR. PROCANIK: Understood, and if this is something you're very passionate about, we can commit to adding additional chargers.

MR. PHILIPS: Just thinking at the way things have changed.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Okay, we'll take them. If he's committed to two more, that's fine. You don't have to talk him --

MR. PROCANIK: We'll start with one.

MR. CRISCUOLO: When they agree, reel the fish in.

MR. PHILIPS: Okay. And the last question, Aaron, could you focus in on the horseshoe kind of odd, weird Y-shaped -- not Y -- U-shaped driveway up on Joanna Court. That one. Get us close. No, not there.

MR. PROCANIK: The truck building to the west.

MR. PHILIPS: The other end of the building. Go west, young man. Okay. There's a loading dock. Can you describe the vehicles you expect to access that.

MR. VITIELLO: Before you comment, correct me if I'm wrong, I believe the loading docks in this image extend under the roof cover. So in that image, you cannot see the whole dock. The space is much --

MR. PHILIPS: Fine.

MR. VITIELLO: I just wanted to let you know.

MR. PHILIPS: I think it's just a reasonable to ask --

MR. VITIELLO: Yeah, yeah.

MR. PHILIPS: -- what vehicles would be going in there to make sure that we have turning radiuses that will be adequate.

MR. VITIELLO: Absolutely.

MR. PROCANIK: WB-67.

MR. CRISCUOLO: And it's one way anyway.

MR. VITIELLO: Intentionally one way.

MR. PROCANIK: It's the largest vehicle we typically design for.

MR. VITIELLO: And our traffic expert will also testify.

MR. PHILIPS: That's fine. As long as we have some validation and our staff would concur with that, that's all.

MR. VITIELLO: We don't want the vehicles that typically visit the site running over the curbs or the -- I mean, it's our facility. We're the building owner. We're also the tenant. So we certainly want to make sure that those trucks can make that turn.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Can we move to where the bowl is in the parking area. That looks like an odd configuration, too.

MR. VITIELLO: That's the municipal street, that part?

MR. CRISCUOLO: No, the driveway. I

mean, up near where the S is.

MR. VITIELLO: Yes, that's the existing driveway, right?

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, it's the existing driveway.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Truck's coming down the roadway, wants to pull in there. What does he do, loop around to get in there?

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, we've run the maneuverability study, and they can access that driveway, and if there's a concern, we'll certainly work with the planning board staff to --

MR. CRISCUOLO: I would ask Mr. Ploskonka to weigh in on that. Wouldn't it make more sense for them to have a little turning radius there, Lou?

MR. PLOSKONKA: We haven't seen the circulation.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Okay.

MR. PLOSKONKA: (Inaudible)

MR. CRISCUOLO: I would think, you know, some kind of ability to turn.

MR. PROCANIK: If I could just throw a little correction on there. If -- this might not be the best plan to look at, but during the rendering, there is a radius that got kind of cut off there.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Oh, okay.

MR. PLOSKONKA: Because of the photo.

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, it's hard to explain, but it's -- there's a radius there. It just got cut off, and the aerial is hiding it. If we wanted to go to sheet 3 of the site plan, it's shown.

THE CHAIRMAN: Adam.

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much. I just -- where do employees enter to this building?

MR. PROCANIK: Today or --

MR. NEARY: No, like, under this proposal. It's not clear to me. Do they come in off of Harts, or do they come in off of the back parking area.

MR. PROCANIK: We do have the architectural renders that should clear that up. If you don't mind, we can get to that in just a moment.

MR. VITIELLO: Those exhibits that will show those doors and items like that.

MR. NEARY: Okay. I'll get to my questions then.

MR. PROCANIK: Everyone wants to get to architecture. No one likes civil engineering.

MR. CRISCUOLO: If I recall, there's a lot of I think -- I don't know how many years ago it was I was in there -- that they're mainly like forklifts moving around picking up material and bringing it back and forth, right?

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, primarily. It's a very low-occupancy building.

MR. CRISCUOLO: It's kind of like (inaudible) in Edison and some of the warehouses that I worked with in Piscataway, so it's a lot of golf carts and various equipment like that that are electric that just bring these people to pick the stuff off the shelf. If I assume correctly, is that the nature of the business?

MR. PROCANIK: Yes.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mary.

MS. PAN: So I have a question about the basin that catches the stormwater from the porous pavement from the parking lot. That's what you mentioned that the porous pavement is for, it will go into the basin. So with this new structure that is on there shaded in beige there, where that's going to go, it's currently trees.

MR. PROCANIK: Correct.

MS. PAN: So all the stormwater that is draining off of the roof, where does that go?

MR. PROCANIK: It goes into the same bioretention basins.

MS. PAN: Okay.

MR. PROCANIK: It will bypass the porous pavement and go right into the basins along the west and the south here. We have a bioretention basin down here, which I may have failed to mention.

MS. PAN: So those are new basins, as well.

MR. PROCANIK: They're new, correct.

MS. PAN: And they would be sufficient to capture all the stormwater that's coming off of that very large roof.

MR. PROCANIK: Yes. We're obligated to comply with NJDEP regulations.

MS. PAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. VITIELLO: And the regulations are more difficult at this time. So the old system, the old building was designed under old regulations. So not only will this capture all the water; it captures all the water under the more difficult, more conservative, newer regulations.

MR. PROCANIK: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other board questions? Okay, thank you. Oh, sorry, staff.

MR. CHEN: I have -- sorry. Thanks. Forgot this. I have a question going back to the EV parking spaces. What is the timeline of installing the EV parking spaces?

MR. PROCANIK: Prior to C of O.

MR. VITIELLO: For the new space, for the new portion of the building.

MR. PROCANIK: It will be -- so the state legislation gives us the option to do make-ready or to do full install. We're opting to do full install, so the installation of the EV should be tied to the approval here tonight.

MR. CHEN: Thank you. I do recommend that that would be a condition of approval if the -- that the EV parking spaces be fully installed prior to condition -- prior to the certificate of occupancy.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you. Understood.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, so your next witness.

MR. PROCANIK: I'm wearing a couple hats tonight. We also want to talk about the architecture.

MR. CHEN: I have another question. Could you describe the purpose of the swale at the south side of the property, the --

MR. PROCANIK: Oh, the swale?

MR. CHEN: Yeah. I'm not entirely certain what swale you're referring to.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: On the south side of the building, there's a drainage feature that drained to the existing detention basin.

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, and we're going to maintain that drainage area. I know I think our plans didn't clearly define that, but we will incorporate that into the drainage patterns that exist today.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So that will be piped to the --

MR. PROCANIK: It currently is piped at some point. There's an existing inlet here that runs it in this general -- I think it was this way. So we're going to redirect it into our new basin. But it will be accounted for, and you'll have the opportunity to review it.

MR. VITIELLO: There was a question about architecture.

MR. CRISCUOLO: One other question I got

over here. Sorry. Is there any fencing planned to be put on the -- where the new addition is on the southerly portion there?

MR. PROCANIK: Are you talking in this general area?

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yeah, like along the dotted line toward -- yeah.

MR. PROCANIK: No, we're not proposing a fence at this time.

MR. VITIELLO: There's nothing there now, right?

MR. PROCANIK: No. There is an existing fence that kind of -- for security purpose to get around the back of the building. If it's a concern to the board, we can certainly add a fence. I don't think we've had that level of conversation with the client for security.

MR. CRISCUOLO: My only concern there is that right next to this is our police impound yard and the salt dome for, you know, other things. So now you're introducing a parking area, you know, not in the impound yard, which we do have fencing around, but double fencing would be good, and now you're putting egress entrance there. So I would like to see some kind of fencing put along that property line. I don't see the need to go all the way back, but at least on the side where the parking lot is back toward there would kind of make sense if the applicant would do that.

MR. PROCANIK: I just want to make sure I'm understanding your request. So the fence would start at our southwest property corner. It would run along that property line to the building and then connect to the --

MR. CRISCUOLO: A little bit deeper than that I would say.

MR. PROCANIK: We can commit to putting a fence in to the start of our bioretention basin.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Okay.

MR. PROCANIK: Which is right around that corner.

MR. CRISCUOLO: And we would like a PVC vinyl so it doesn't fall apart, no board-on-board, because our experience is, you know, they get X amount of years out of that.

MR. PROCANIK: Sure. No problem.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I like you guys. Keep going.

MR. PROCANIK: If you like us that much, can we move to a vote? I'm joking.

MR. CRISCUOLO: You made the EV charging stations and the fencing. That we think is reasonable. We're a reasonable board, but we need to protect our residents and you plan for the future.

MR. PROCANIK: Understood. Thank you.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have an engineering question. Can this roof be made solar ready?

MR. PROCANIK: Yes. We do need to verify what the DCA requirements are, but barring any restriction from the DCA, our answer is yes.

MAYOR COHEN: I thought it's a state requirement that 40 percent of the roof has to be --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's 40 percent of newly constructed warehouse. Now, the act does not define what newly constructed is. Is it, like, built from the ground up from a raw build, or does it apply to expansions.

(Inaudible)

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But I think maybe the simpler thing is if they can make it solar ready, that would be the best.

MAYOR COHEN: We've been doing that as a habit in all new expanded applications.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Mayor.

MAYOR COHEN: In all of our applications that we've had come to the board for industrial expansion or new buildings, we've required that, so we've established a pattern of doing that. So I think being in consistent with what we've been done, I would agree that it should be 40 percent, which is the state law for solar-ready.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Agree to that?

MR. VITIELLO: Yes, new roof. We will make sure the new roof is solar ready, that can structurally support solar.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The new part of the roof or the whole roof?

MR. VITIELLO: The brown roof, just the brown roof, yeah.

MR. PHILIPS: When you say solar ready, that doesn't sound like there's any panels there.

MR. VITIELLO: No. We don't know whether we would install panels or not. It depends on a lot of additional factors. But the requirement is that the roof be designed to support the weight of that if, in fact, they come at a later time, particularly if a tenant came into this building that used a lot more electricity because the panels

can't really generate more electricity than we use on site, and storing the paper doesn't use a lot of electricity. But we could get a tenant that uses a lot more electricity in the future.

MR. PHILIPS: I didn't know that's how it worked. I thought that if you overproduced, you give it back to the grid.

MR. VITIELLO: You do. You do. But on an annual basis, you cannot overproduce; otherwise, you're a power plant and you need licensing as a power plant. So but on a good month when it's very sunny, you can overproduce, but it has to be offset by a cloudy month. Net metering. That's net metering. Otherwise, we couldn't get a license to be a generator here.

(Inaudible)

MR. VITIELLO: No, no, no, I understand, but that's how they -- the net metering generally works. So you'll see it, like, hospitals and people that use a lot of power, they don't have a problem, but, you know, certain buildings don't always use as much electricity.

MAYOR COHEN: There's also certain state programs that will pay you to sell the money back to the grid if you're willing to participate. So you use --

MR. PHILIPS: Lot of homes in East Brunswick sell it back to the grid.

MR. VITIELLO: Right, but all of those use more than they generate on an annual basis. None of them are generators. They're all net metered.

MR. CRISCUOLO: The yearly net is the amount that they have, so they -- because they just have lighting in these places. They're not a high power usage.

MR. PHILIPS: They're not temperature controlled?

MR. VITIELLO: For paper. I don't know what the temperature is for paper. I know I wouldn't keep the paper at 68 degrees in the summer. So it is somewhat temperature controlled.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I think --

MR. PHILIPS: -- 151 is the temperature that it bursts.

MR. VITIELLO: Well, I would keep it cooler than that, yeah, so -- but, no, we would definitely comply with the requirement to make sure the roof is -- can support that weight.

MR. CRISCUOLO: One site that I worked

at it was more about the humidity control, which uses a lot of electricity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CHEN: I have one more question. You mentioned the staffing for the existing building, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Do you know what -- do you know -- what would be the proposed building in terms of staffing hours of operation and anticipated truck deliveries, for example? Basically, what would the -- would the proposed building have different characteristics than the existing building in terms of those --

MR. PROCANIK: Understood. So we're expecting an additional two more employees, full-time GRM employees, and a few additional temporary employees. That number hasn't yet been determined, but if four employees, current -- temporary employees service the 208,000-square-foot, I would expect it to be less than four for the new portion of the building. So gun to my head, I would say five.

In terms of delivery, we do have a traffic engineer. I don't want to steal all her thunder, so Miss Briehof would be happy to address that.

MR. VITIELLO: And the hours of operation aren't changing.

MR. PROCANIK: No, they're not, 9 to 5. And then I believe there was also a comment that I think I may have missed addressing. The light, the site lighting, it will be shut -- with the exception of emergency purposes, the site lighting will be shut off about an hour after the facility closes, and it will be turned on about an hour before the facility opens, and that's just for the safety of the employees.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other board questions, staff?

MR. CRISCUOLO: Is there a representative from the actual firm here this evening that we could ask questions to or requests?

MR. VITIELLO: Representative -- that was our intention to have that representative here, but unfortunately, they were called out of the country. So we are able to communicate, not at lightning speeds, but we've gathered as much information as we can from the representative because he couldn't make it here tonight.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I don't know if this is the appropriate time to ask this question, but let

me throw it out there. Would the applicant be willing to perch along Harts Lane license plate readers to prevent crime and have the feedback to the East Brunswick Police Department? We made that request to an applicant two weeks ago, and they were willing to do that. I don't see more than one stanchion with two cameras in it on Harts Lane for the protection of people coming to the unit. The store that is moving into a complex near there thought it was a great idea, and we're trying to expand our license plate readers out in the community. If you're storing sensitive products there, it probably could be used as another plus for your marketing campaign. And I would ask that you, you know, work with the chief of police and utilize, you know, equipment that's compatible with -- compatible that we're already obtaining from the state and the county along Ryders Lane, Route 18, and where we have installed in some of the shopping plazas, and some of the homeowners associations actually have volunteered to do that, as well. That is one request that I know it's not in our ordinance yet, but possibly be looking into that. And many places are installing them. So I don't know if the applicant would be willing to put a set of them in at the site. Like I said, there is -- they're in shopping centers along the highway, as well. You know, if somebody was going down there, it's a stolen vehicle, or it would read every license plate that's there, record it. You know, if you had an incident in your site, it would help the PD with their investigation.

MR. VITIELLO: Are you asking for the applicant to permit some area of his property to have PD readers?

MR. CRISCUOLO: No, I'm asking the applicant to go into a contract with a license plate reading company that would install the cameras there and, you know, the expenses -- from what I hear from the police department, we just got a grant for \$80,000, and we're installing, like, between 16 and 26 of them on highways in the town, and they would read license plates, and then when there's a hit, it comes back to the dispatch center, and they'd say, there's a stolen car on Harts Lane that's been recorded by the New Brunswick Police Department or somebody coming out of your complex, and like I said, we've been starting to peel the envelope and add these throughout the township through grants, through county. The county is doing it on the

county roads and so on. It's for crime prevention, and if you're securing important documents there, I think it would be an added nice feature for you all.

MR. VITIELLO: Well, I certainly think that my client would be willing to discuss it, but I don't have authorization to commit to that.

MR. CRISCUOLO: That's why I asked if you had a member --

MR. VITIELLO: Yeah, I don't have authorization to commit to that as a condition of any approval the board may choose to grant. You mentioned grants. Are you saying there's grant money that would be available?

MR. CRISCUOLO: That was available to the municipalities and the county through --

MR. VITIELLO: I mean, my client may be interested in it, and I would certainly pass it on to him, but I'm not authorized to really agree to that as a condition of approval.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MR. PHILIPS: Charlie.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, Steve.

MR. PHILIPS: I have a question about -- and I think this is more for staff. Fire suppression systems. We have all this paper. Iron Mountain and South Brunswick or wherever that was. And just curious whether or not this area has sufficient water systems available for the building to be able to offer fire suppression for all that paper. And I guess they wouldn't know, but I'm going to have to ask staff whether or not that would be something that -- are the lines big enough. Do we have enough water pressure there, et cetera, to run a fire suppression for a building of this size.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So the short answer is that analysis isn't done yet. They have to do hydrant flow tests and demonstrate to the fire official that there's adequate flows and pressures.

MR. PHILIPS: That will be handled, in other words.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, that will be --

MR. PHILIPS: Can't give them a CO if we don't have enough water to suppress a fire.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I don't even think they can get a building permit unless they demonstrate --

MR. PHILIPS: Fair enough. I just wanted it on the record.

MR. VITIELLO: The fire official

reviewed our plans, and there were a few things he wanted changed. And the DPW reviewed our plans. They wanted more fire hydrants. They wanted a fire hydrant added at every corner of the building. So we would certainly agree to comply with those conditions. So he's asked us to put more fire suppression in and around the site, which we could certainly agree to.

MR. PHILIPS: Just asked a question.

MR. VITIELLO: No, no, it's a good question, and the building will be sprinkled. Obviously, the building will be built with sprinkles and stuff like that.

MR. PHILIPS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, if there are no further questions.

MR. VITIELLO: We can talk briefly about the architecture if you'd like. Okay, great.

MR. PROCANIK: If you wouldn't mind, we did submit architectural plans. Yeah, that's perfect. That's it. That's it. It's three sheets. So that's the first of three, yeah, and this was previously submitted to the board. Has not been changed. But this is our floor plan.

MR. VITIELLO: So, Mr. Chairman, if we're submitting -- if we're showing you a plan as it's been submitted to the board, some boards prefer not to mark those, just to refer to it as something that's already been submitted, or if you prefer, we could indicate it as a marked exhibit. It's up to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Normally, Larry Sachs would tell us what's what on that.

MR. KROLL: Last time you didn't mark them. If they were submitted, they weren't marked.

MR. VITIELLO: Would you like to mark it?

MR. KROLL: In the last application, if they were submitted, we did not mark them.

MR. VITIELLO: We'll indicate on the record this next exhibit has been submitted. It's unaltered. It's as it's been submitted as part of our application.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: A-101?

MR. PROCANIK: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: From Bergman Architects.

MR. PROCANIK: Yes, and we do have -- I'm sorry -- consisting of three sheets, a floor plan, elevations, and then a colorized version of

those elevations.

So we do have our architect here in the audience if there is any detailed questions, but if it's okay with the board, I'd like to just run through these, and then if there's questions, we can have our architect address them.

So what you're looking at on the screen right now is the floor plan for the proposed expansion of the building. We have a 2,500-square-foot office at the southeast -- southwest corner of the building, which will be where the entrance is, Mr. Neary, and we'll touch on that with the elevations, too.

As previously discussed, we do have the truck loading docks underneath the building. It just wasn't grayed out or shaded in the render so it may have been a little difficult to see, but those will support the WB-67's. Those are 73.5 feet exactly from bumper to bumper, but we typically step out 75 just for a little bit of cushion.

One of the unique parts of this addition is that the finished floor elevation of the addition is 8 feet lower than the finished floor of the existing building, and we needed to do that because the existing terrain of the land slopes towards Harts Lane, and we didn't want to have to build the building 8 feet higher than it really needed to be. So with that, we are going to have a penetration from the existing into the proposed addition, and it will be a ramp system for the employees to navigate from one side to the other.

Moving on to the elevation, if we can just skip over to the color. There we go. So the north elevation is what we were just looking at. That's going to be -- just make sure I have my notes in front of me. I don't want to miss anything. So that north elevation, that is going to be from Joanna looking towards the three loading docks. The south elevation is from behind the building where the wetlands are looking at the back. Really, no one should ever be looking at this part of the building. And then on the last is the west elevation from Harts, and that's going to be the main entrance in that lower left, right there where the parking lot is.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you. Are there any questions about the architectural (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Getting back to my other question, I guess on the south elevation, which 103, the existing part of the building, please confirm

that there are three entrance -- there's three doorways there.

MR. PROCANIK: Those? Those are for emergency egress purposes only.

MR. NEARY: Okay. And now, the proposed parking along there, there are improvements to the parking?

MR. PROCANIK: That's the south. That's behind the building. There's no parking back there.

MR. NEARY: East --

MR. VITIELLO: I think we're getting our sides confused.

MR. NEARY: Yeah. The east side.

MR. PROCANIK: Looking east, so.

MR. VITIELLO: Those are just emergency.

MR. PROCANIK: So if we could --

MR. VITIELLO: Now we want to talk about the east.

MR. PROCANIK: Looking -- the west elevation. Looking west. I'm sorry, this one. So this is where the limits of the proposed parking, that's the front. This is Harts right here. We're standing at Harts looking at the building.

MR. NEARY: The other side of the building.

MR. VITIELLO: He wants to look what the old parking lot is.

MR. PROCANIK: The old parking lot?

MR. VITIELLO: The other side of the building.

MR. PROCANIK: Okay.

MR. VITIELLO: The other side of the building, the portion of the building that faces east.

MR. PROCANIK: Faces east.

MR. VITIELLO: Faces east. Here where we're rebuilding, he wants to know where the EV spaces are going to be.

MR. PROCANIK: There's -- let me just take a quick look.

MR. VITIELLO: So I believe, if I'm correct -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- the elevation detail is provided for the expansion area.

MR. PROCANIK: Yes.

MR. VITIELLO: So the non-expanded area, as you can see in our exhibit, is kind of shown in generic white, not a lot of detail there, but I don't think that's proposed to change, but I can still ask, to answer your question, what doors are there and where they are. It's a good question.

I'm sorry we don't have something that shows that, but we can get you that data.

MR. PROCANIK: The doors will be at the northeast corner of the existing building near the ADA parking, near the EV. (Inaudible) when this was built along Joanna. There is a provided sidewalk along the building up Joanna maybe three-quarters of the way up the building, and that was the main entrance. With this new parking lot configuration, we're going to provide a door accessible for ADA and EV and anyone else parking at the rear near that northeast corner.

MR. NEARY: So you're providing a handicapped accessible door on the existing structure, as you say, the northeast corner where there's the two ADA spots there. That's kind of where my question --

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, we're going to provide an ADA accessible path, one million percent, yes. Sorry for that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mayor.

MAYOR COHEN: I didn't have a question. Just they should have provided that. There is a change.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I know there are a number of things that were, you know, going off this a little bit, that when you looked at the -- when you looked at the report, when you looked at this report -- and I'm sure you've met since -- but, you know, there were a lot of little de minimus mistakes we'll call them, calculations. There were other things that were on the important side that were not addressed, and, you know, I hope that, you know, since the report came out that some significant gains were made because this application to me, you know, could be a pretty straightforward, simple application to make decisions on that we make all the time, but there seem to be a lot left out, and where you're taking somebody's word for something that something was done, but you have no -- you don't have anything to take a look at to see that's correct, and then when you see even though it's de minimus, the other things, you see a number of things that we'll say just aren't correct. I certainly want to see everything work out. I work, okay, I'm a banker throughout my whole career. So if you see a lot of little things that either not provided or incorrect, you start thinking, well, what else aren't we being told, you know, do we have a full picture of the things that are important,

okay. So I know there's been subsequent meetings, and, you know, I hope as we go through the rest of this, you know, that we find that we don't, you know, have to spend a lot of time on things that to me, before the application, you know, came in that should have been worked out, okay. So maybe they are worked out, okay, but, you know, as things come up, you know, if we still have to work things out afterwards, then you're going to spend a lot of time before this gets going, you know what I mean. So it's better for the applicant -- and the goal is always to make it work, okay, if it should. So, you know, that part isn't an issue, but it's also to help the applicant to get things moved along so now they can expand the building and can have this additional income and everything, all right.

So, Mayor, I'm sorry. I lost my track here a little bit, which we should have and don't have.

MAYOR COHEN: I was just saying that there was a change to the back of that one side of the building and there's no picture of it. I know it's not the building side that you're working on, but you are making changes to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. PROCANIK: There's just going to be some minor changes. I would consider it to be immaterial. There is -- aren't doors back there.

MAYOR COHEN: We get it.

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, and to discuss the review letter as a whole, we did receive a letter from CME, an e-mail from the fire marshal, and a letter from the DPW, and we will address each and every one of those comments to their satisfaction.

MR. VITIELLO: So the review letter, as I'm sure you're accustomed to, have a number of comments, minor comments. Our professional, our consulting staff, has reached back out to your staff after the review letters were issued, and we're able to comply with all the comments in the review letter. So we can certainly go one by one if the board prefers, but we've touched on items that require testimony. We're making sure we provide testimony on those. And for items where they say the applicant should show the invert of this pipe or the applicant should, you know, show the height of this curb, all of those comments we absolutely have no problem complying with. We would agree to those as a condition of any approval, absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: And what we'll do at the

end is we typically go through the report, okay, that CME provided, all of us, and you just say we agree and we provide testimony for this. So we're all on the same page and we can help the process move along.

MR. VITIELLO: Understood. Understood.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Anybody have anything to bring up. No? Move on.

MR. VITIELLO: So if it pleases the board, we'll present our traffic expert.

THE CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. Okay, Mr. Vitiello?

MR. VITIELLO: Yes, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of our members just mentioned that the exhibit we had was black and white and this is a different color so we have to give it a number.

MR. VITIELLO: Okay, so we'll mark that. Is A-3 acceptable?

THE CHAIRMAN: A-3 is acceptable.

MR. VITIELLO: And A-3 I think would be the third page, third page of the three-page elevations of the outside of the building. Third page is now going to be referred to as A-3, applicant's Exhibit A-3 for the record, because the change that was made from the submission is the rendering. The color was added. Is that good for the record?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. VITIELLO: Okay, great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So Miss Briehof, can you please introduce yourself.

MS. BRIEHOF: Sure. Michelle Briehof, Colliers Engineering & Design, traffic engineer on behalf of the applicant.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MS. BRIEHOF: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we'll go back over a little part of this. First name, last name, spell your last name for me, please.

MS. BRIEHOF: Sure. It's Michelle, M-i-c-h-e-l-l-e; last name Briehof, B-r-i-e-h-o-f.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And a little bit of your CV. I know where you work, but, you know.

MS. BRIEHOF: Sure. So I am the geographic discipline leader for traffic planning at Colliers Engineering & Design. I have a degree in

civil and environmental engineering from Northeastern University. I've been a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey since 2014. I have appeared before East Brunswick. I'm not sure if it was the planning or the zoning board. It was a while ago. But I've also appeared before, you know, dozens of other boards in some of the states.

THE CHAIRMAN: We accept you.

MS. BRIEHOF: Thank you.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you. Michelle, you heard the testimony that's been presented so far tonight and you're familiar with the exhibits and the application as submitted?

MS. BRIEHOF: Yes.

MR. VITIELLO: Okay, great. And you've looked at the review letters regarding the review of the applicant from the board's consultants?

MS. BRIEHOF: Yes. I will try to keep it as brief as possible. We did prepare a traffic impact study for the proposed expansion of this development. For this traffic study, we included the intersection to the north, which is Tices Lane with Harts; the intersection of Harts with Joanna Court; and then the existing driveway for the existing building along Joanna. So we did go ahead and do traffic counts at those locations. We determined what the peak hour was for those intersections. And then what we do from there is we typically figure out how much traffic this proposed expansion will generate.

I do want to explain that a little bit. So what we did for the proposed expansions is we did reference the Institute of Transportation Engineers, which is, you know, what the industry standard would be in this situation. So we found that with the Institute of Transportation Engineers, the maximum increase in traffic would be 22 peak hour trips. However, I do want to say that since we did do traffic counts at the existing driveways for the existing operation, I can tell you that we counted a maximum of three trips going in and out of the driveway. So this is, you know, a very low traffic generator. I think from the previous testimony that you heard, given that it's a storage facility for paper, for files, for things like that, you know, we're not -- and a maximum of, you know, two to three employees per shift and stuff like that, we're not looking at a lot of trips. So when we went ahead and estimated the number of trips associated

with the expansion, and using ITE, you know, that was a very conservative estimate of trips. I don't even believe that it will be an additional 22 peak hour trips. But we did again take the conservative approach.

And then to just go back to trucks and deliveries, with that we also saw, you know, one trip, one peak hour truck entering the facility. So I think we estimated that the daily number of truck trips for something like this would be, you know, no greater than 10 trucks, and that would be any deliveries or trucks just coming to the facility with, you know, loads of these storage items.

With that, we then added that additional traffic onto those study locations that I previously mentioned. We found that all of the intersections that we studied, including the site driveways, would operate at levels of service B or better. The intersection of Joanna Court with Harts Lane would continue to operate at a level of service C. So again, we're not looking at a tremendous increase in traffic or, you know, any degradation to the adjacent roadway system.

I know we mentioned parking. The parking supply per ordinance would need to be 65 spaces. We're providing 70 spaces, so we feel again that the proposed parking supply, especially given the intended use of the site, is more than adequate.

And that really concludes, you know, our traffic study and what we prepared for this.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you. (Inaudible)

THE CHAIRMAN: Any board questions, staff questions?

Just you're not adding a lot of traffic to a heavily traveled road, so, you know, that part is good. So this is not, you know, big issue with this application.

MS. BRIEHOF: Yeah, I agree, and again, it's -- we even just went above and beyond as far as being conservative and estimating the number of trips, but I do feel it will be a negligible increase in traffic even with the addition of the site.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, you know, when I was there and I saw the parking lot -- I'll call it the one in the back near the sign -- all know is referenced in the report, there were a lot of parking spaces. So you would assume that there were, you know, at some point there were a lot of employees, but, no, huh?

MS. BRIEHOF: Yeah, not for this operation, yeah.

MR. VITIELLO: It's a good ratable. There's no (inaudible) there's no kids.

THE CHAIRMAN: That works.

MR. VITIELLO: There's not a lot of traffic. It's a good company. Been (inaudible) they really like the location, like the community. So they look forward to hopefully investing in an addition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Thank you very much.

MS. BRIEHOF: Thank you.

MR. VITIELLO: Mr. Chairman, you mentioned your professional staff wanted to go through the review letters. Unless there's any other questions for any of my team, I'm happy to present my witnesses to answer any additional questions.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Could you just repeat the variance that they're looking for from the front setback.

MR. VITIELLO: Yeah, and I'll ask Mr. Procanik, who's also our planner, I'll ask him to briefly just touch on all those for the board.

MR. PROCANIK: So we are asking for two variances this evening. The first one that was just mentioned is a setback from the southwest building corner. It's 40 feet setback for a rear yard. We're 38.9, so we're 1.1 feet shy of meeting that. The side yard setback, however, in the zone is 35 feet. So if we looked at that yard as a side yard -- by definition it's not, but from practicality and proximity to Harts, it could be argued that it is if it wasn't a corner lot, we would be fully compliant with that setback.

MR. VITIELLO: Does that variance condition extend along that whole property line?

MR. PROCANIK: No.

MR. VITIELLO: Only for a few feet in front?

MR. PROCANIK: Only for a few feet. As you can see, the angle of the property line to the building is obtuse, so as a property line kind of veers off, that distance between the building grows, and it becomes compliant within a few feet of the building corner.

MR. VITIELLO: And there's another variance, also, right?

MR. PROCANIK: There is. There is a

second variance along Harts Lane, and that is relative to the screening. The ordinance requires any parking lot in a front yard, which we are proposing, provide a 20-foot buffer for visual screening. We are proposing a 10-foot buffer with the intent to meet the same -- the intentions of the ordinance of visual screening from Harts.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think staff kind of addressed that in that you're going to buffer it properly and sufficiently so it's not going to be an issue.

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, and these bioretention basins are heavily vegetated to begin with. We just want to be conservative and say that we're not going to be able to give you 20 feet strictly dedicated to a buffer, but we do get something with the bioretention basin, which is 49 feet wide.

MR. VITIELLO: And, Mr. Chairman, as you mentioned, the applicant agrees to supplement that and provide additional plantings in there to enhance the buffer because of that condition.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine.

MR. VITIELLO: And, Mr. Procanik, so the two variances you mentioned and the conditions, the property conditions, the existing property conditions, the existing structures on site, in your opinion as a planner, you've described the burden the applicant's under. As the applicant, do you think this application meets that burden?

MR. PROCANIK: I do.

MR. VITIELLO: Is that the information you're looking for on the variances?

MR. CRISCUOLO: Uh-huh.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And I was just going to say, just -- this is a unique property, correct?

MR. PROCANIK: Correct.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Would you say that the variance is driven by the unique circumstances of the property?

MR. PROCANIK: I would, yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And the rear yard line, I mean, you've already said it. That's unique. The building, itself, is oriented straight on to Harts and Joanna, correct?

MR. PROCANIK: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So it is a little practical difficulty to try to make that, and you're only about 1 foot off?

MR. PROCANIK: 1.1 feet, 13 inches.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And it's next to the DPW.

MR. PROCANIK: That's correct.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So in your professional opinion, you know, the setbacks are there for light, air, and open space.

MR. PROCANIK: Correct.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is there more than sufficient light, air, and open space between this building and the DPW?

MR. PROCANIK: Yes.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Clarification. It's not DPW. It's the police impound yard.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Sorry about that.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Big difference.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That is true.

MR. CRISCUOLO: DPW is across the street.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. So the police impound yard.

MR. PROCANIK: The police impound yard.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So you have sufficient space between the --

MR. PROCANIK: Yes, sufficient space.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. So, I mean, and that's all I have to say. So basically, I mean, if counsel hadn't asked, does it have a substantial detriment to the zone plan?

MR. PROCANIK: No, sir.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Does it have a substantial impact upon the public?

MR. PROCANIK: No, sir.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other staff or board questions? Okay.

MR. VITIELLO: Mr. Chairman, I don't have further direct testimony, but you mentioned going through the reports. Did you --

THE CHAIRMAN: We could go through the reports unless somebody wants -- anybody wants to take a short break, we can do that, as well. If not, we'll go continue. Okay. Yankees actually have runs, guys, so.

MR. VITIELLO: My watch must be broken because it says the Yankees are winning 6-0 in the fourth inning. Got to be something -- oh, Judge. He's rested for how many weeks and weeks. He has to make up for it.

MR. PHILIPS: His toe is actually

better.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. Okay, then we can again go through the report.

MR. VITIELLO: We can certainly proffer that we would comply with the comments. If you wanted us to go one by one or there's any specific comments that you want us to talk about, we're happy to proceed however you prefer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Usually, we go through -- well, some areas of the report are easier than others. You know, when you -- as an example, when you hit the site plan comments and, you know, which is on page 6 and site plan number 2 and you have questions 1 to 17, you can say 1 to 17 are okay, but --

MR. VITIELLO: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: But on the first page, you provided all of those reports so there's nothing, you know, to say there. And I would say that -- let's see. Bear with me a minute.

MR. CRISCUOLO: If you agree with everything that Mr. Ploskonka is asking you to do, just move it in in bulk. That's all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. VITIELLO: Okay. We do. We do agree. We can comply with all those planning comments on section I, 1 through 6. We will correct those or comply with those comments, site plan comments, Mr. Procanik, 1 through in the section 2, 17.

THE CHAIRMAN: Say the pages you're looking at.

MR. VITIELLO: The pages. So we're starting at page 6 and going through page 8. That's section 2, site plan comments 1 through 17. Can we comply with those? We will comply?

MR. PROCANIK: Item 14 we provided testimony to. That was a potential variance request, but we removed that, and we will provide the enclosure for trash.

MR. VITIELLO: Right. There was a question whether or not we were going to need a variance because we did not -- it wasn't clear whether we were going to put an enclosure around our dumpster, but we absolutely will, so we will comply. There wouldn't be a variance for that. So that was really just a clarification.

On section 3, Mr. Procanik, items 1 through -- and this is stormwater, 1 through 18, again -- or 17 -- 1 through 18 for stormwater.

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, section 3, stormwater management, grading, and drainage comments, items 1 through 18 on pages 8 through 10 we will comply with.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you. And water comments, section 4, starting on page 10 and 11.

MR. PROCANIK: Going to 11, 1 through 9, we can comply.

MR. VITIELLO: And sewer comments, section 5, starting on page 11 and ending on page 12, being items 1 through 6.

MR. PROCANIK: We can comply.

MR. VITIELLO: And traffic comments, section 5, starting on page 12 and ending on page 14, 1 through 15.

MR. PROCANIK: Can comply.

MR. VITIELLO: Can comply, okay. Thank you. And then returning from lighting comments now, which is section 7.

MR. PROCANIK: Landscaping.

MR. VITIELLO: Oh, I'm sorry. I skipped landscaping. Landscaping requirements, also on page 14, items 1 through 8, which is section 6 under the report.

MR. PROCANIK: Can comply.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Item 1 is the variance. That was more of a statement at this point.

(Inaudible)

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's not you comply; it's just you clarified.

MR. VITIELLO: Clarified, preventing his testimony. Thanks for the clarification.

MR. NEARY: I have a question. And landscaping, 1, 8. You're proposing to essentially tear down 650 trees. The last sentence in subsection 8 is the required monetary contribution should be indicated on the plans. Is there any --

MR. PROCANIK: We don't have that number ready for the board tonight. We will absolutely add it to the plans. Staff will review, and whatever financial monetary contributions the applicant owes, they will pay.

MR. NEARY: Put that on the record.

MR. VITIELLO: We will comply. I believe we're on section 7, which starts on page 14 and goes to 15. This is items 1 through 5, Mr. Procanik.

MR. PROCANIK: Can comply.

MR. VITIELLO: And --

MR. PROCANIK: Well, it says item 2 is testimony, but we can add that to the plan as a note.

MR. VITIELLO: And environmental comments is next on page 15, items 1 through 4, please.

MR. PROCANIK: Can comply.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Actually, can we go back to lighting, because I'm looking at comment 1, because there's more -- was that discussed about the average lighting about .75-foot-candles?

MR. VITIELLO: We would modify it. I think --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just want to make sure because that was more subjective item.

MR. VITIELLO: We would make those modifications.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. VITIELLO: Mr. Procanik talked about adjusting the lighting.

MR. PROCANIK: We'll meet the ordinance requirements.

MR. PHILIPS: Then there was a clarification on the timing.

MR. VITIELLO: We talked about the timing and the safety lighting, right. After when it's not open, it's only safety lighting.

MR. PROCANIK: And we will add a note to the plans.

MR. VITIELLO: One hour before and one hour after.

MR. PROCANIK: Correct.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Unless otherwise needed for emergency or life safety issues.

MR. VITIELLO: Talking about the business operation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Pretending I'm an attorney.

MR. VITIELLO: Environmental comments. (Inaudible) items 1 through 4.

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, we'll comply.

MR. VITIELLO: And miscellaneous comment, section E.

MR. NEARY: Hold on one second. Get back to environmental. Just make sure the plans are revised to show the wetland transition area.

MR. PROCANIK: Yes, we do have that, and if they weren't shown on the plans, it was a layer being turned off, so I apologize, but we do need to obtain certain DEP approvals. We do have a current

LOI. We'll just make sure they're depicted on the plans.

MR. VITIELLO: Also on page 15, miscellaneous comment is, Mr. Chairman, one item.

MR. PROCANIK: Yeah, and any township details we will certainly add to our plans.

MR. VITIELLO: And the last item -- the last section was section 9 on page 15 and 16 -- this was discussed -- the status of letters of no interest and/or approvals by other agencies. Mr. Procanik, you can touch on these real quick.

MR. PROCANIK: Certainly.

MR. VITIELLO: DEP said we've applied and we're waiting for that.

MR. PROCANIK: We have not yet applied. We will apply. We have an LOI, correct, yeah. We will need certain permits from the DEP. We will obtain those and provide them to the township for their review. Middlesex County Planning Board, we did receive an approval. If you have not received that, we're happy to provide that. Freehold Soil Conservation District, we did make our initial submission. They did have to comments, and we were waiting for this evening before we made a resubmission back to them.

MR. VITIELLO: (Inaudible) depending on the site plan approval?

MR. PROCANIK: Any comments the building department issues we'll happily address. The water and sewer, I would assume that is the --

MR. VITIELLO: Received it, yes. Item F, Bureau of Fire Safety we received.

MR. PROCANIK: We received a letter dated August 15, 2022, from the director of public works, water and sewer. We will comply with all of these comments.

MR. VITIELLO: And also, there's a reference to the Bureau of Fire Safety.

MR. PROCANIK: We received an e-mail -- just trying to find the right date -- from August 16, 2023, from Shawn Verdi, fire marshal, East Brunswick, asking for one, two, three comments.

MR. VITIELLO: Can we comply with those comments.

MR. PROCANIK: Yes.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Can you read those because they're requesting for us to change their ordinances at the next council meeting, and I want to make sure that includes those requested changes.

MR. PROCANIK: The request is to have a

fire hydrant be added at each corner of the building, a red light above the fire department connection.

MR. CRISCUOLO: That's it. You're done. I just wanted to make sure he included that in his report. We've been working with them to change the township ordinances next Monday to include that. So I just wanted to make sure it was in there.

MR. PROCANIK: And I'm going to sneak this one in there on you, sir. Fire alarm panel will be placed in the same location as sprinkler valve. We will comply.

THE CHAIRMAN: There's one from the code enforcement officer. This is back from July 12.

MR. PROCANIK: Oh, the site valuation, yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is to do with everything from trees to no striping in the lot.

MR. PROCANIK: We did discuss that at the TRC meeting. We will comply with everything in that letter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Everything on there?

MR. PROCANIK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kroll, you writing some things down there they've agreed to, correct?

MR. KROLL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Always best to be, you know, on the safe side and make sure that everything is understood by everyone. Would you just go over what you have for us, please.

MR. KROLL: The applicant has indicated they'll comply with all of the various conditions and comments made by the CME report and by the various municipal arms, water and sewer and the fire marshal. They've indicated they'll comply with all of the third party approvals that they need to get. They've gotten approval from the Middlesex County and applied to Freehold and you applied to the DEP, and I think that you said that you will also work with the town regarding the financial contribution for the landscaping. (Inaudible) other details that might come up that need to be addressed through the course of compliance, they'll also, you know, work with the town to make sure that those are addressed, as well, but that they will be ancillary to complying with the major points which have been brought up and you agreed to comply with today.

MR. VITIELLO: Yes, yes, we agree to that.

MR. PHILIPS: The lighting.

MR. VITIELLO: Yes, there was also the fence. We agreed to put a fence in the southwest corner.

MR. KROLL: To put the fence in along the side.

MR. VITIELLO: Two more -- we're going to put in two more EV spaces. We've agreed to put in two more EV spaces, so four total, and separate them on either side of the building. We've also agreed to make sure --

MR. KROLL: (Inaudible) the fence, and you also will talk with your principal about the possibility of putting in license plate readers.

MR. VITIELLO: We'll -- not as a condition of approval.

MR. KROLL: No, but you have that conversation and report back.

MR. VITIELLO: Well, we'll also make the roof on the addition will be a solar-ready roof. We'll upgrade that roof to be a solar-ready roof.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I thought was already part of the requirements.

MR. VITIELLO: Yes. I'm sorry.

MAYOR COHEN: They said we didn't add the idea of the solar-ready roof because we thought that it was already a requirement.

MR. VITIELLO: Understood.

MAYOR COHEN: That's why we didn't say it was an addition.

MR. VITIELLO: I got it. I understand. I apologize. Sorry for that.

MAYOR COHEN: It's just a --

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I'm just a little disheartened that you're not interested in putting in license plate reader, certainly because, you know, we have small shopping plazas that didn't look for as many variances. You're looking for a buffer reduction from 10 -- to 10 feet from 20. And in the meantime, I was communicating with the chief of police and the captain there. It's a yearly maintenance cost of \$2,500 per camera, so it would be like 5,000 a year. I'm doing some quick math. The cameras, themselves, are less expensive than probably running the communication line and the electric to the site where they would have the license plate readers. I just don't understand.

Once again, majority of the time, the attorney's able to get in touch with the applicant over these small items, you know. The applicant's

not here. Like last board meeting, the proprietor that wanted to put in the facility was able to get in touch with their owner and committed to it. You know, it's less than \$10,000 for the install after they install the electrical and so on. He says it's more on the, you know, you're running electric anyway to put some lights up, and then the \$2,500 fee per year for camera for the feed and so on.

So I'm just a little disheartened that you're asking for a variance for a relatively large facility on a pretty active roadway where there's tractor trailers coming in with sensitive information. So that's all my comments on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know your applicant is out of the country.

MR. VITIELLO: I texted him. I'm trying to see if he's responding.

THE CHAIRMAN: See what time it is there.

MR. VITIELLO: It's 1 a.m. where he is. I don't have a response. Do you have a response?

MR. CRISCUOLO: Cheaper than his flight to Italy.

MR. VITIELLO: Yeah, so I have confirmation from him, 1 a.m. wherever he is reading his text, that we can agree -- he doesn't have a problem with that.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good.

MR. VITIELLO: If he was here, that would have been a much shorter process.

MAYOR COHEN: We appreciate that.

MR. CRISCUOLO: That's why it helps that they're here.

MAYOR COHEN: We appreciate that. It's a matter of safety for all of us, and Harts Lane is a major arterial connector road between Tices and Milltown Road, so it does have its share of crime. Of course, they could end up in the police impound lot, too, right next to where you're located in. But we've asked it of every applicant that it would become problematic of us to ask it in the future if we start letting people off. So it's the pattern that we'd like to keep, and it has significantly cut down crime or helped in solving crime throughout the township and in places where it is in place. So I think it's something we should be all trying to be as a community participating in trying to help each other out.

MR. VITIELLO: I agree, Mr. Mayor. You

know, I'm just the attorney, but I have clients. We have -- on top of our warehouses we've installed the microphone systems for the town that can identify exactly where a gunshot is because they have three microphones throughout the town. So I have other clients that have those on their facilities.

MR. CRISCUOLO: We didn't ask for that.

MR. VITIELLO: No, no. I'm just the attorney. I'm not the landowner.

MR. CRISCUOLO: And this board knows I can be pretty tenacious, so if you look, my picture is in the dictionary after that word.

MAYOR COHEN: Okay, Joe, okay. Reel him back in now.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know there's a lot of the public here tonight, but I have to open it up. So if anyone from the public would like to speak, please come on up to the podium. I see no one. I close the public portion.

At this point, if there are no further board questions or staff questions, would somebody like to make a motion on this application?

MR. HASHMI: I make a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mohammed makes the motion.

MR. McEvoy: Second.

MAYOR COHEN: Councilman McEvoy.

THE CHAIRMAN: McEvoy, okay. So it's been -- we have a motion. We have a second. Roll call.

MS. TEGEDER: Mrs. Pan.

MS. PAN: Yes.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. Neary.

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Just want to make sure they do everything they can to check on the solar panel requirement. Yes.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. McEvoy.

MR. McEVOY: Yes.

MS. TEGEDER: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. TEGEDER: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Yes.

MS. TEGEDER: Chairman Heppel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

This application is approved.
 Congratulations and wish you success with the

addition.

MR. VITIELLO: Thank you. Thank you for your time, members. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Jessica, the next meeting is?

MS. TEGEDER: September 13.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, everybody.

MR. PHILIPS: Need a motion to adjourn?

THE CHAIRMAN: We now do, yes. Is it still 6 nothing? Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Okay.

MR. VITIELLO: Bottom of the fifth inning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have a nice evening, everyone.