

**EAST WINDSOR TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES OF April 18, 2016**

The meeting of the East Windsor Township Planning Board was held on Monday, April 18, 2016, in the East Windsor Township Municipal Building, 16 Lanning Boulevard, East Windsor, New Jersey, 08520. Planning Board Chairperson Edward Kelley called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m.

**STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE**

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

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Mr. Brady, Mayor Mironov, Ms. Patel, Mr. Schmidlin, Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Kelley

Members Absent: Mr. Berman, Mr. Catana, Mr. Clark, Mr. Theokas

Professionals and Staff Present: Allison Quigley, Planning Board Secretary  
Michael W. Herbert, Board Attorney  
Richard Preiss, Township Planner  
A. Maxwell Peters, Township Engineer  
Daniel Dobromilsky, Township Landscape Architect

**REPORTS/CORRESPONDENCE/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chairperson Kelley stated that everyone must file their Financial Disclosure Statements by Friday, April 29<sup>th</sup>. He also announced that the Environmental Commission will be giving away tree saplings to celebrate Arbor Day on Saturday, May 7<sup>th</sup> at the PAL fields on Airport Road.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

Chairperson Kelley opened the meeting to the public. There being no public comment, the public forum was closed.

**MINUTES**

**March 7, 2016**

Mayor Mironov asked that each individual's full name, company, and role in the project be clearly provided at the beginning of their testimony for both sets of minutes tonight, as well as any other minutes moving forward.

MOTION TO APPROVE MARCH 7, 2016 MINUTES WITH CHANGES MADE BY: Mr. Schmidlin

MOTION SECONDED BY: Ms. Patel

ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Brady, Mayor Mironov, Ms. Patel, Mr. Schmidlin, Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Kelley  
NAYES: None  
ABSTAINS: None

**March 21, 2016**

Mayor Mironov asked to hold the minutes until the next meeting. Chairperson Kelley agreed.

**RESOLUTIONS**

**RESOLUTION 2016-11** Hovione LLC  
40 Lake Drive  
Block 20.01, Lot 23  
Preliminary and Final Site Plan with Waivers

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2016-11 MADE BY: Mr. Schmidlin

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Brady

ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Brady, Mayor Mironov, Ms. Patel, Mr. Schmidlin, Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Kelley  
NAYES: None  
ABSTAINS: None

**RESOLUTION 2016-12** Nijjar Realty  
Route 130 South  
Block 15, Lot 14.02  
Waiver of Site Plan

Chairperson Kelley stated that a revised copy of the resolution, as well as a red line version indicating the revisions made, were provided in the members' folders this evening. Mr. Herbert stated that a revision was made regarding the bullnose treatment, as it was unclear from his notes where the treatment would be placed along the building. Mr. Herbert stated that the location was clarified by Mr. Preiss and Mr. Peters and would run along the front and run around to the rear of the building. He stated that the resolution was revised to reflect that accurately.

Mayor Mironov stated that she had several comments beginning on page seven. She stated that the proposal was for a waiver of site plan review and the Board ultimately agreed to a modification to the plans on the items that were set forward at the public hearing. She stated that in light of that, several of the conditions of approval that are listed on pages seven, eight, and nine, specifically conditions numbered four, five, six, and seven do not apply to this proposal. She also stated that the resolution needs to clearly state that the conditions and specifications from the prior resolution remain in full effect. Mayor Mironov stated that the previous resolution should also be referenced by number in this resolution. Mr. Herbert stated that he will correct the resolution.

Mayor Mironov stated that page one, second paragraph should be revised to include the prior resolution referenced by number and date. She stated that page six, the first paragraph under item number fifteen references specific conditions to be fulfilled, but there were none associated with this approval. She added that the fourth paragraph should read that the Board granted the applicant a waiver of site plan review and approved the amendment.

Mayor Mironov asked that the resolution be carried to the next meeting on May 2. Chairperson Kelley agreed.

## **APPLICATIONS**

**EWT File #PB15-001                      Promenade at East Windsor (Parec Construction)**  
671 Route 33  
Block 14, Lots 977, 979, and 980  
Amended Preliminary Site Plan with Variances

Chairperson Kelley announced that the application would be carried to June 20, 2016 with no further notice required by the applicant.

**EWT File #PB15-007                      One Mile Storage**  
79 One Mile Road  
Block 5.01, Lot 11  
Preliminary and Final Site Plan with Variances

Chairperson Kelley asked Michael Herbert, Board Attorney, to swear in the Board's professionals: Richard Preiss, Township Planner; A. Maxwell Peters, Township Engineer; and Daniel Dobromilsky, Township Landscape Architect. Mr. Herbert swore the professionals in.

William Mehr, Esq. of Mehr, LaFrance, & Williams is representing One Mile Storage LLC, the contract purchaser of the subject property located at 79 One Mile Road, also known as Block 5.01, Lot 11.

Chairperson Kelley stated for the record the following reports have been received from East Windsor Professionals and Supervisors: Philips Preiss Grygiel, dated April 7, 2016, Exhibit B-1; T&M Associates, dated April 8, 2016, Exhibit B-2; Daniel Dobromilsky, LLA, dated April 7, 2016, Exhibit B-3; Chief of Police Harry Marshall, dated April 5, 2016, Exhibit B-4; Fire Official Kevin Brink, dated April 7, 2016, Exhibit B-5; and the East Windsor Township Environmental Commission, dated March 16, 2016, Exhibit B-6. Mr. Mehr stated that the applicant was in receipt of these reports.

Mr. Herbert stated that he had reviewed the public notice published by the applicant prior to tonight's hearing and found that it was a sufficient notice and the Board has jurisdiction for action on tonight's application.

Mr. Mehr stated that the subject property measures approximately 7.17 acres and was a residual piece of land that remained after the construction of the Route 133 bypass. The site is uniquely

shaped, as it is quite narrow and long, measuring 2,500 feet in length and 89 feet in width at its widest point. He stated that the western portion of the property are wetlands and flood areas, but the area for development is currently cultivated and does not encroach upon the wetlands. He stated that the development area is all below the grade of the bypass, except for the very rear portion which is almost at the same grade. The site is north of the existing McGraw Hill facility, and is bordered by One Mile Road to the east and the Route 133 bypass to the north.

Mr. Mehr stated that the applicant is proposing to construct a self-storage facility, which is one of the only uses that would fit on this parcel. The proposal consists of 40,500 square feet of regular self-storage facilities, 1,000 square feet of office space, and 23,100 square feet of recreational vehicle storage. There is a total of ten buildings that all face a central interior driveway.

Mr. Mehr stated that the unique shape of the property causes the need for several variances that the applicant is seeking. The applicant is seeking relief from the minimum lot width requirement, minimum front yard setback requirement, minimum side yard setback requirement, and the required landscaping areas on either side of the property.

Mr. Mehr stated that he has several witnesses present at tonight's hearing: Michael Intile of Crest Engineering, project engineer, will be testifying regarding the site plan and the proposed landscaping and lighting plan; Michael McCloskey of One Mile Storage LLC, the contract purchaser of the property, will be testifying regarding the existing conditions and the proposed architectural elevations; Scott Kennel of McDonough and Rea Associates, project traffic engineer, will be testifying regarding the traffic impact of the site; and Allison Coffin of James W. Higgins Associates, project planner, will be testifying regarding the requested variances.

Mr. Mehr introduced the project engineer Michael Intile of Crest Engineering as the first witness. Mr. Herbert swore in Mr. Intile.

Mr. Mehr asked Mr. Intile to go over his credentials for the Board. Mr. Intile stated that he is a professional engineer and planner in New Jersey and has been working as a professional for over 25 years. He stated that he has worked on numerous development applications in New Jersey in the past and has been accepted as a professional witness in front of several boards in the state in the past. Chairperson Kelley accepted his credentials.

Mr. Intile entered Exhibit A-1, titled "Aerial of Site and Surrounding Area," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence.

Mr. Intile stated that the property is a long and narrow parcel and measures 89 feet in width at the widest point and 2,500 feet in length. The property is located in the R-O zone and is approximately 7.17 acres.

Mr. Intile entered Exhibit A-2, titled "Rendering of Landscape Plan," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence.

Mr. Intile stated that Exhibit A-2 shows the development split into two pieces. The upper portion on the exhibit is the east side of the development, and the lower portion is the west side. He stated that the proposal is to construct ten buildings for a self-storage facility. The office building will

be on the east side of the property and the remaining nine buildings will run east to west, with the last building placed in front of the storm water basin. He stated that the office building will be the smallest building, and the rest of the buildings will vary only slightly in size. Mr. Intile stated that two buildings were optioned to be storage for recreational vehicles and would only be three sides with one open side to allow the vehicles to enter.

Mr. Intile stated that the paved areas offer a large turn around area that would accommodate larger recreational vehicles and emergency vehicles. All onsite parking would be located in the front of the site, with seven parking stalls in front of the gate and five additional overflow spaces just west of the gate.

Mr. Intile stated that the applicant is proposing two storm water management basins. The front basin is a detention basin that will collect storm water and discharge it to the existing drainage structures along One Mile Road. The rear basin would be an infiltration basin which would allow the collected storm water to infiltrate back into the ground. He stated that both basins meet all ordinance requirements.

Mr. Intile stated that in terms of lighting, the applicant is proposing four 20 foot high pole mounted lights in the front area with high pressure sodium lighting. The rest of the site would have mounted wall pack lighting along the building facades. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Intile if all the lights were below the height of the buildings. Mr. Intile stated that they were.

Mr. Intile stated that the landscaping plan features a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees toward the front of the site and additional landscaping would be scattered along the north side for buffering and along the rear near the infiltration basin.

Mr. Intile stated that the applicant is requesting several variances due to the unique shape of the lot. The applicant is requesting a variance regarding the required front yard setback. He stated that the set back is required to be 150 feet but the applicant is providing 101 feet. The applicant is also requesting a variance regarding the side setbacks. The side set backs are required to be 50 feet, where the applicant is providing five feet due to the narrowness of the site. The applicant is also requesting a variance regarding the buffering landscaping strips. They are required to be 100 feet from the right of way, where the applicant is providing 50 feet.

Mr. Intile stated that the site would have fencing from the front gate area wrapping around in between the buildings along the paved area. The fence sections between the buildings would provide a closed interior area for the site. The fencing would not continue around the backs of the buildings. Chairperson Kelley asked if the fence would wrap around the back of the infiltration basin in the rear. Mr. Intile stated that it would not.

Mr. Mehr asked Mr. Intile if there were any wetlands on the site. Mr. Intile stated that there is a tributary associated with wetlands, as well as an isolated pocket of wetlands on the site, both of which do not affect the development area. Mr. Intile stated that the applicant had received letters of interpretation from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection for both areas.

Mr. Intile stated that there is a proposed identification sign that measures eight feet high and sits on two feet of decorative blocks, making for a total height of ten and a half feet. The sign measures twelve feet wide and measures 96 square feet total. The sign would be illuminated by two ground mounted lights and would meet all ordinance requirements. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Intile if the sign would be in the basin area or if it would be in front of the basin. Mr. Intile stated that the sign would be within the edge of the landscaping area and the basin will not approach the sign. He clarified that there was a typographical error on the submitted plans that would be revised with the proper contours.

Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Intile if the site had sewer and water access. Mr. Intile stated that it does. Mr. Preiss asked if any plumbing would be in any of the storage buildings. Mr. Intile stated that the water would only be connected to the office building, as the other buildings aren't required to have sprinklers.

Mayor Mironov asked Mr. Intile to review the proposed lighting plan and to indicate the average lighting intensity for the site. Mr. Intile stated that there would be four 20 foot high pole mounted lights in the front parking area that would measure 250 watts. He stated that any other lighting on the site would be wall mounted lights on the various storage buildings that would be mounted between 12 and 14 feet in height. Mayor Mironov asked what the lighting intensity for the site would be. Mr. Intile stated that the lighting plan had been prepared by the project landscape architect Richard Leer and while the lighting does conform to the ordinances, the average intensity for the site had been overlooked on the plans. Mr. Intile stated that the submitted lighting plan shows that the lighting intensity measures 0.9 foot candle at the center of the light pole and decreases from the point. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Intile what the lighting intensity is at the property line facing the adjacent residences. Mr. Intile stated that the highest intensity at the property line measures 0.7 foot candle. Mr. Mehr stated that the facility would not be open 24 hours per day and asked Mr. Intile if any lights would be on overnight. Mr. Intile stated that the applicant would probably want some security lighting on site, but that would be up to the Board. Mayor Mironov stated that the Board would like to minimize any security lighting that would be on all night. Mayor Mironov asked if the pole mounted lights would be shielded. Mr. Intile stated that they would be shielded to reduce and light spilling over toward the residences. Mr. Peters stated that the average foot candle should be indicated on the plans to make sure that it is in conformance with the ordinance and any security lights need to be identified. Mr. Preiss asked how far the nearest light pole is to One Mile Road. Mr. Intile stated that the nearest pole mounted light would be 70 feet from the road.

Mayor Mironov asked Mr. Intile to review the proposed basins in regards to size, slope, and appearance. Mr. Intile stated that the front basin is irregularly shaped to fit into the setback areas and features a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees and shrubbery around the perimeter to buffer it from view. The basin would be consistently maintained and would have a grass bottom. He stated that water would not typically sit in the basin, but there may be some water in the basin immediately following a storm until the water was discharged into the system. Mayor Mironov asked Mr. Intile what the slope of the basin would be. Mr. Intile stated that the slope would be about five to one and would be a gentle slope. Mr. Mehr asked Mr. Intile how many trees would be around the basin perimeter. Mr. Intile stated that there would be twelve trees. Mr. Mehr asked Mr. Intile to clarify where the identification sign would be in relation to the basin. Mr. Intile stated

that there was a topographical error on the plans that inadvertently showed the sign being within the basin area. The sign would be located above the slope of the basin and the plans would be revised to show that properly.

Mr. Dobromilsky stated that the grading plan show that the basin top is at elevation 98 and the highest the water can reach in the basin is elevation 98.15. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that if this were accurate, there would be a point where the water would reach One Mile Road and there would be no perimeter to the basin. Mr. Intile stated that there is a slight slope from the edge of the roadway to the edge of the basin and then a more significant slope further into the basin. Mr. Dobromilsky asked if the proposed landscaping would be within the basin. Mr. Intile stated that it would be. He added that the contours on the plan would be pulled into the site and the plans would be revised. Mr. Peters stated that while that change will enhance the safety and visual impact of the area, the area of the basin will be reduced so that should be taken into account for any drainage calculations. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that the basin would just be a shallow, low area and with the additional landscaping it would not appear to be a basin.

Chairperson Kelley asked Mr. Dobromilsky to address the deficiency of trees on the site. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that because the basins are low and flat, they have a larger perimeter and based upon the Township ordinances, more trees would be required around the perimeter of the basin. He stated that he calculated that there was a deficiency of 70 trees. However due to the unique size of the site there might not be enough area to plant all the required trees, so the Board will most likely have to grant some relief in that aspect. He added that there are areas on the site where the applicant could add more trees to reduce that deficiency.

Mr. Dobromilsky stated that the rear basin is about three to four feet deep and is well hidden from view. Mayor Mironov asked if it was hidden from view from Route 133. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that it was. He added that the 70 tree deficiency was for both basins, as the rear basin is required to have 48 trees and the applicant is providing 12. He stated that there may be room to add a few additional trees to mitigate some of the deficiency. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that the basin would have a flat, sand bottom but the entire basin is well hidden from view from any adjacent properties or roadways. Mr. Mehr stated that the applicant will revise the landscaping plan and present it to the Board.

Mayor Mironov asked Mr. Intile to address the requested variances regarding the front and side setbacks. Mr. Intile stated that the development is set back 101 feet from the right of way along One Mile Road, however the ordinance requires the setback be 150 feet. Mr. Intile stated that they had to reduce the setback due to the narrowness of the site. He stated that the side set backs are required to be 50 feet but the applicant is proposing a side set back of five feet, also due to the narrowness of the site. Mr. Intile stated there is also a requirement for a landscape buffer to be set back 100 feet from the road. The applicant is proposing a setback of 50 feet. The side landscape buffers are required to be 50 feet from the property lines, but the applicant is proposing zero feet.

Mr. Dobromilsky asked Mr. Intile what type of fence the applicant is proposing. Mr. Intile stated that the fence would be black aluminum picket fencing that would measure six feet in height. Mr. Dobromilsky asked if the fence would be the same color and material as the gate. Mr. Intile stated that it would be. Mayor Mironov asked if the applicant had any pictures of renderings showing

what the fencing would look like. Mr. Mehr stated that they would provide a visual rendering to the Board of the fencing. Mayor Mironov asked where the fence would be located. Mr. Intile stated that the fence would start at the gate along One Mile Road and would run north along the property line to the next building. No fencing would run behind the buildings, just in the sections between the buildings to close off the interior area. Mr. Shapiro asked if the fence would require a lot of maintenance to maintain its color. Mr. Intile stated that it might need maintenance down the line but would not require a lot of maintenance.

Mr. Peters stated that the rear infiltration basin is partially within a wetland area so the Board might like to see more documentation that the soils in that area are permeable and the basin will operate properly. Mr. Intile stated that they would provide a full soil profile.

Mr. Peters asked Mr. Intile what the intended use of the five additional spaces behind the gate would be. Mr. Intile stated that they were intended for overflow parking if necessary. Mr. Peters asked if they would be used for rental vehicles for moving. Mr. Intile stated that they would not be used for rental vehicles, just overflow or employee parking.

Mr. Mehr introduced the principal of the project Michael McCloskey of One Mile Storage LLC as the next witness. Mr. Herbert swore in Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. McCloskey entered Exhibit A-3, titled "Existing Conditions from Route 133 Bypass," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence. Mr. McCloskey entered Exhibit A-4, titled "Cross Section Exhibit," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence.

Mr. McCloskey stated that Exhibit A-3 shows the existing conditions of the site as seen from the Route 133 bypass facing south. Mr. Mehr asked Mr. McCloskey if the east side of the property has a natural tree buffer. Mr. McCloskey stated that it did.

Mr. McCloskey entered Exhibit A-5, titled "Existing Conditions on Subject Property," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence.

Mr. Mehr asked Mr. McCloskey if any of the existing trees on site would be removed. Mr. McCloskey stated that no existing trees would be removed. Mr. McCloskey stated that one of the photos on Exhibit A-5 shows a man standing approximately 50 feet from the road to illustrate how far the proposed setbacks would be on the site.

Mr. McCloskey entered Exhibit A-6, titled "View from Route 133 Facing South," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence.

Mr. McCloskey stated that as discussed, the rear basin would be hidden from view from Route 133. He also indicated that the buildings would be low so as to minimize any visual impact.

Mr. McCloskey entered Exhibit A-7, titled "View from Route 133 Facing Southeast," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence.

Mr. McCloskey stated that they tried to minimize the visual impact of the site by mimicking a typical farm property. The office is modeled after a farm house and the larger building behind it



is modeled after a barn. The remaining buildings were made to be low with brown siding and red doors to mimic chicken coops.

Mr. McCloskey entered Exhibit A-8, titled "View from One Mile Road," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence.

Mr. McCloskey stated that Exhibit A-8 shows the site as viewed from One Mile Road facing west. The office building and the larger connected storage building are in the front and the rest of the buildings are visually blocked from view. Mr. Mehr asked Mr. McCloskey if the rendering shows the proposed landscaping plan. Mr. McCloskey stated that the rendering may not be completely accurate in terms of landscaping but it attempts to show the proposed landscape buffer.

Mayor Mironov asked how far the sign is from the road. Mr. McCloskey stated that the sign would be 15 feet from the right of way and 28 feet from the road.

Mr. McCloskey entered Exhibit A-9, titled "Architectural Floor Plan and Elevations for Office Building," dated April 18, 2016 into evidence.

Mr. McCloskey stated that Exhibit A-9 shows the elevation and architectural floor plans for the front office building. The office building will have white vinyl siding with a covered deck area. The building would also be handicap accessible. Mr. Mehr asked Mr. McCloskey what the hours of operation would be for the facility. Mr. McCloskey stated that while those hadn't been finalized yet, they would be around 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM. There would not be 24 hour access to the site.

Mr. Mehr asked Mr. McCloskey if the applicant is still proposing the identification sign to include the facility's phone number. Mr. McCloskey stated that would be removed so the sign would conform to the ordinance.

Mr. Mehr asked Mr. McCloskey which side would be open on the vehicle storage buildings. Mr. McCloskey stated that the open side would face towards the interior of the site and would not be visible from anywhere other than inside the site. Mr. Mehr asked Mr. McCloskey if he anticipated anyone operating a business out of the storage facility. Mr. McCloskey stated that they would not expect that and it would just be used for self-storage and recreational vehicle storage. He added that they are proposing to have an open side as most recreational vehicles are quite large and would need that open space in order to enter the building. He stated that this service is intended for residents who have larger recreational vehicles, RVs or boats that they cannot store at home. This would provide them a safe place to store them that is not visible to the public. Mr. Mehr added that the vehicle storage buildings could be converted into regular storage units if there was no market for this service. Mr. Mehr asked Mr. McCloskey what would be involved in converting the buildings to regular storage. Mr. McCloskey stated that the other standard storage buildings on site sit on a concrete pad, whereas the vehicle storage buildings are just on pavement. He stated that they would have to take out the floor and replace it with a concrete pad and then place the modular units in. He stated that this process would come back in front of the Board if they needed to convert them. Mayor Mironov asked if any of the vehicles would be parked outside of the buildings. Mr. McCloskey stated that they would not be parked outside of the buildings.

Mr. McCloskey stated that in terms of materials, the storage buildings would feature metal seemed roofs and ribbed panels for siding. The front building would feature insulated paneling and a decorative ridge. The larger building behind the office building would feature Timberline HD shingles in the color called white, which appears as a light gray color.

Mr. Dobromilsky asked Mr. McCloskey if the front building would be air conditioned. Mr. McCloskey stated that it would be. Mr. Dobromilsky asked where the HVAC units would be located. Mr. McCloskey stated that the plans would be revised to show their location. He stated that the outdoor units would be approximately 1,000 square feet and would appear similar to a residential unit. While they cannot put the units on the roofs, they will screen it and put the units in between buildings to further buffer them from view. Ms. Patel asked Mr. McCloskey how large the units would be. Mr. McCloskey stated that the units would be about four feet by five feet. Mayor Mironov asked if the units would be visible. Mr. McCloskey stated that they would not be visible, they would be screened with enclosures and additional landscaping. Ms. Patel asked what color the units would be. Mr. McCloskey stated that they could either be gray or light green, whichever the Board prefers.

Mr. Preiss asked Mr. McCloskey if the vehicle storage would also be for construction equipment or trucks for businesses. Mr. McCloskey stated that he would not expect that as they would not have hours conducive to business vehicle storage. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. McCloskey if the applicant could provide a clear list of what types of vehicles would be permitted and not permitted to be included in the resolution. Mr. McCloskey stated that they would provide those details. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. McCloskey if any rental vehicles would be on site. Mr. McCloskey stated that they might consider renting vehicles to users but those vehicles would not be stored on site. Mr. Mehr stated that an option might be to store a single rental truck strictly for the storage business in the vehicle storage building if the applicant desired. Ms. Patel asked Mr. McCloskey how large the rental truck would be. Mr. McCloskey stated that it would be smaller, similar to a typical U-Haul truck.

Mayor Mironov asked Mr. McCloskey for details on the trash enclosure such as materials and colors. Mr. McCloskey stated that they will provide all those details to the Board.

Mr. Mehr introduced the project traffic engineer Scott Kennel of McDonough and Rea Associates as the next witness. Mr. Herbert swore in Mr. Kennel.

Mr. Mehr asked Mr. Kennel to go over his credentials for the Board. Mr. Kennel stated that he has over 35 years of professional traffic and planning experience and that he has appeared before planning boards as an expert witness in over 100 towns in New Jersey. He added that he has appeared before the East Windsor Planning Board for several projects as a professional traffic consultant over the years. Chairperson Kelley accepted his credentials.

Mr. Kennel stated that he reviewed the site plan and prepared a traffic impact study that was submitted with the application. He stated that he took an inventory of the existing conditions on One Mile Road and found that the peak traffic hours were from 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM with a traffic count of 430 vehicles and from 4:45 PM to 5:45 PM with a traffic count of 150 vehicles. Mr. Kennel stated that the anticipated traffic impact of the site was calculated based on gross floor area

and he calculated that there would be approximately 18 trips generated during the morning and afternoon peak hours. Over a twenty four hour period approximately 250 trips would be generated. Mr. Kennel stated the self-storage use is a less intensive use in terms of traffic.

Mr. Kennel stated that his traffic analysis indicated that the entrance and exit driveway would work at acceptable levels of service. The driveway would operate at level service B during morning peak hours and level service C during afternoon peak hours. The north bound left hand turn onto the site would operate at service level A.

Mr. Kennel stated that the applicant is proposing 15 parking stalls for the site. He stated that the township parking requirements do not have a standard for self-storage facilities but based on his experience a similar facility only requires 6 to 10 spaces.

Mr. Kennel stated that on site circulation could accommodate larger vehicles, including emergency services vehicles.

Mr. Mehr introduced the project planner Allison Coffin of James W. Higgins Associates as the next witness. Mr. Herbert swore in Ms. Coffin.

Mr. Mehr asked Ms. Coffin to go over her licensure and experience for the Board. Ms. Coffin stated that she has been a licensed professional planner in New Jersey for over twelve years and has been accepted as a professional witness in front of other planning boards in over 85 municipalities. Chairperson Kelley accepted her credentials.

Ms. Coffin stated that the lot is an unusual shape and size that was created due to the construction of the Route 133 bypass. She stated that due to the unusual shape of the lot, several bulk variances were being requested by the applicant. The applicant is requesting relief from the side set back requirement of 50 feet, as the lot is only 89 feet at its widest point, so the site cannot accommodate the required setbacks. Ms. Coffin stated that the ordinance also requires that all product storage facilities be completely enclosed but the applicant is proposing two storage buildings with only three sides to accommodate larger recreational vehicles.

Ms. Coffin stated that the Municipal Land Use Law sets forth two tests for the granting of bulk variances. The C-1 or hardship variance is appropriate when a lot's unique shape or preexisting legal structures results in a hardship to conform to the bulk standards. The C-2 or flexible variance can be granted when purposes of the MLUL are advanced by the request and the benefits of the variance outweigh any detriments. Ms. Coffin stated that in her opinion the requested variances could be granted under both the C-1 and C-2 variances. She stated that regarding a hardship variance, the set back and landscaping variances could be granted as C-1 variances as the lot was created due to the creation of the Route 133 bypass and the unique size and narrow shape of the lot make it impossible to use without some relief from both ordinance requirements. Regarding the C-2 flexible variance, the function of the three sided recreational vehicle storage buildings would be providing a beneficial service to the community and would meet a unique need for the residents. She added that the self-storage use is one of the only uses that can fit in this property and the variances requested enhance the visual attractiveness of the site as well. She added

that in her opinion the benefits substantially outweigh any detriments and that granting these variances would not negatively impact the Township Master Plan or the zoning ordinances.

Mr. Preiss asked Mr. McCloskey if they would have any way of monitoring the contents of the storage units. Mr. McCloskey stated that the leases signed by the tenants would explicitly state what can and cannot be stored on site and would allow the owner to enter if there was a cause for concern. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. McCloskey if he would be comfortable with this right being granted the Township Police Department as well and Mr. McCloskey agreed.

Chairperson Kelley stated that the following items were outstanding and further details were to be provided by the applicant prior to a second hearing: the overall site average lighting intensity; security lighting and lighting schedules; additional landscaping details for the front and rear basins; details on HVAC units and screening; details on permitted and non-permitted vehicles for storage; information on any rental vehicles; trash enclosure details and renderings; signage detail and renderings; hours of operation; and fence details and renderings. Mayor Mironov also requested the applicant provide information on the estimated tax assessment of the project.

Chairperson Kelley announced that the application would be carried to May 16, 2016 with no further notice required.

#### **ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

#### **CERTIFICATION OF SECRETARY**

I, undersigned, do hereby certify;

That I am the Planning Board Secretary of the Township of East Windsor Planning Board and that the foregoing minutes of the Planning Board, held on April 18, 2016, constitute a true and correct copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name of said Planning Board this 16<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2016.

---

Allison Quigley, Board Administrative Secretary  
East Windsor Township