

**MILLSTONE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 13, 2007**

At 7:30 p.m., Chairman Newman called the meeting to Order.

Salute to the Flag.

Roll Call: Present: Blanco, Kucziniski, Kurzman, Pinney, Pepe, Newman and Weintraub. Absent: Grbelja, Sico, Murphy and Pado.

Roll Call reflects that there is a quorum in order to being the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 9, 2007 Minutes tabled to July 11, 2007 Meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION: Chairman Newman Open the Public Comment Portion at 7:31 p.m. Seeing no public comment, hat portion of the meeting was closed at 7:31 p.m.

RESOLUTIONS:

P06-15 MILLSTONE PROPERTIES INVESTMENT – Block 16, Lots 11.01, 11.02, 11.03 located on Prodelin Way consisting of 9.87 acres inthe HC zone. Applicant seeks Preliminary Site Plan Approval to construct a single-story, 9,905 s.f. day care center, along with a 9,025 s.f. two-story office with 6,000 s.f. dedicated to storage. Preliminary Site Plan Approval granted 5/9/07.

Mr. Pepe made a Motion to Memorialize the Resolution and Mr. Kucziniski offered a Second. Roll Call Vote: Pepe, Kucziniski, Blanco, Kurzman, Pinney and Weintraub voted yes.

P07-07 DUREK– Block 13, Lot 3.01. Located on Fairplay Road 58.08 acres located in the R-UP Zone. Applicant is before the Board with request for determination of entitlement to farmland division of property into two parcels; proposed lot 3.03 consisting of 31.06 acres to be farmed and proposed Lot 3.04 consisting of 27.01 acres to be donated to Monmouth County. The Board found the proposed division to be for agricultural purposes.

Mr. Blanco made a Motion to Memorialize and Mr. Pepe offered a Second. Roll Call Vote: Blanco, Pepe, Kucziniski, Kurzman, Pinney, Weintraub and Newman voted yes to memorialize.

EXTENSION OF TIME:

P05-23 RIORDAN – Block 45, Lot 10.04. Located on Stage Coach Road and Charleston Spring Road. 27.61 acres located in the RU-p zone. Minor

Subdivision extension of time granted through June 15, 2007. Applicant returns for an extension of time to perfect minor subdivision.

Richard Cohen representing the applicant. No notice of this meeting was required. Mr. Cohen explained that the Planning Board granted the applicant an extension of time on March 14, 2007. He advised the Board that everything is done except that the applicant has not secured bonding of the project. He explained that they had gone to six different bonding companies before securing bonding of the project. The applicant is meeting with the bonding company next week .

Engineer Shafai agreed that all plans are done and that the applicant had her original bonding amount reduced by performing a tree count. The Board discussed a practical time. Attorney Steib explained the process.

Ms. Pinney made a Motion to extend the time to August 8, 2007 and Mr. Kurzman offered a Second. Roll Call Vote. Pinney, Kurzman, Blanco, Kuczinski, Weintraub, Pepe and Newman voted yes to the extension of time.

CARRIED APPLICATION:

P06-02 33 ASSOCIATES (RIVERSIDE CENTER) – Block 18, Lot 2.02. Located on Route 33. 57.7 acres located in the PCD Zone. Applicant seeks Final Major Subdivision Approval to subdivide property into 9 individual sites. Preliminary Major Subdivision approval granted 12-13-06. Extension granted to 6/30/07.

Mr. Steib reads the Exhibits into Evidence as follows:

- A-6 Project Architectural Design Standards prepared by Bach & Clark, undated
- PB-6 Board Planner's review, dated June 12, 2007, of Bach & Clark's proposed Architectural Design Standards

William Mehr, Esq. representing the applicant. The matter was carried from the May meeting to allow the Board Planner time to review the architectural standards. Applicant's architect, Gregory Clark of Bach and Clark presented was sworn in, presented his credentials and was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Clark advised that the applicant has attempted to bring a sense of homogeneity to the project. He explained the materials that were selected where chosen to be able to mix well with each other. He explained how they tried to keep the look traditional. Flex roofs would be flat as compared to pitch roofing of other buildings in the park. Mr. Clark offered samples and examples of the standards to the Board and audience. Basic main colors are burgundy for the roof, dark and light split face rock. Granite samples will be displayed in the front of the building. They will not use vinyl lap siding or cedar siding. Mr. Mehr advised a set of selection samples would be provided for Mr. Coppola's review for each building. Each time the applicant came back for site plan review, the Board Planner could look to make sure that there is conformity.

Mr. Coppola's memo regarding the architectural standards reviewed. Mr. Mehr offered that they have a mixed-use situation with retail, office, warehouse. Signage requirements are different for different uses. CN concerns regarding standards will be the same in Monroe. Mr. Mehr advised if he places the standards into the property owners' association standards, both towns would be uniform in architectural standards.

Mr. Clark went over the proposed signage as reflected in his design standard report. Box signs are permitted for corporate logos since it is an already established look. Mr. Clark discussed the signage type, height, etc. Sign plans will accompany each site plan. Signage shall comply with the Township Ordinance. The location of the pylon was discussed. Engineer Shafai advised that the applicant proposes a sign detail on every site. He asked if this will change and how would that fit into the picture. He asked that the applicant place this revision in the revised plans. Planner Allen Schectel suggested guidelines for uniformity for signs hanging from canopies. Mr. Clark explained how long buildings are broken-up with architectural design for interest and to add detail to the buildings. Mr. Canter stated that the LED signs have become popular. He suggested that if the Board is entertaining using them, that they set standards for them. Planner Allen Schectel considers animated signage to be a distraction and cheapens the look of the center. The Board discussed language to assure that LED signage is not used.

Jay Troutman of McDonough and Rae was sworn in as applicant's traffic expert. Mr. Troutman appeared before the Board previously and was accepted as an expert. Mr. Troutman testified that he had reviewed Mr. Canters' letter of April 6, 2007. He advised that the plans were revised to address those comments. Mr. Troutman prepared a sketch per Mr. Canter's request that would be reflected in the final plans. Mr. Troutman stated that he could meet the 50 mph speed limit throughout the Park except for the properties that they do not control.

Signage and stripping would be addressed. Mr. Canter went through his letter of April 6th, working with Mr. Troutman and feels that his concerns are addressed. Mr. Canter advised one location where DeBaun and Farrington meet is a safety concern and he would work with Mr. Troutman in resolving those concerns. Mr. Canter explained that site triangles should be shown to reflect the anticipated speed of the vehicles. Mr. Troutman met the intent of Mr. Canter's concerns and that should be reflected on the final set of plans.

Mr. Canter raised concerns regarding Old Route 33. He asked that the applicant prepare an engineered drawing of the sketch to make sure the intersection works. Engineers Canter and Shafai would review the engineering sketch in lieu of the Board reviewing. Mr. Canter voiced concern about whose jurisdiction that portion of the road belongs to. He does not want anything to fall through the cracks. The intersection is part of Phase II. Mr. Troutman explained the process

and timeline for the intersection. Engineer Shafai requested that the NJDOT permit be issued prior to signing off on the plans. Engineer Shafai asked about the speed limit. Mr. Canter explained how a speed limit is established. Initially, the statutory speed governs. Based on building frontage, 35 mph was discussed. The procedure was discussed wherein the governing body adopts an ordinance to set the speed limit. Mr. Canter feels if it meets physical criteria of the definition, the speed limit is set. Engineer Shafai has no major open engineering issues with the application.

Chairman Newman opened the application to the public at 8:49 p.m. and seeing no public comment, the Chairman closed the public portion at 8:50 p.m.

Vice-Chairman Pepe made a Motion to approve and Mr. Kuczynski offered a Second. Attorney Steib read the conditions of approval including, all prior conditions of approval as set forth in the Resolution of Preliminary approval are carried through Final, additional notes regarding the conservation easement, lighting concerns are to be resolved, easement documents are to be forwarded to the Board and Township Attorneys and Board professionals for review and approval, technical comments to be addressed by the Board professionals, Mr. Coppola's report and Bach & Clark's architectural design standards are part of the approval as benchmark samples for comparison reference for future applications in the development, this also applies to signage standards, LED signs are not permitted, final plans are to be satisfied by Mr. Canter's comments, realignment of Old Route 33 is to be sent for the review and approval by the Engineers Canter and Shafai, 35 mph speed limit is to be established through the appropriate process, applicant must obtain all outside approvals including NJDOT approval, no exterior storage unless specifically approved by the Planning Board.

Vice Chairman Pepe amended his Motion to include the conditions as set forth and Mr. Kuczynski offered a Second. Roll Call Vote: Pepe, Kuczynski, Blanco, Kurzman, Pinney, Weintraub and Newman voted yes to approve.

P06-11 IDEAL TILE – Block 18, Lot 2.03 Located on Old Route 33 and Farrington Blvd. 14.93 Acres located in the PCD Zone. Applicant seeks Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval to construct a 94,500 s.f. warehouse/storage area, a 4,000 s.f. showroom and 4,000 s.f. of administrative offices. Jurisdiction accepted 5/9/07.

Attorney Steib accepted jurisdiction over the application at the May 9, 2007 meeting. The meeting was carried without any further noticing required.

- A-1 Jurisdictional Packet
- A-2 Web Notice Posted 4/24/07
- A-3 Application dated 6/27/06
- A-4 E I S prepared by Crest Eng. Dated 4/18/06 last revised 8/15/06

- A-5 Historic Pesticide prepared by Crest Eng. Dated 2/28/05 last Revised 3/14/06
- A-6 Subsurface Soil Investigation prepared by Crest Eng. Dated 10/10/06
- A-7 Stormwater Management prepared by Crest Eng. Dated 4/24/06 Last Revised 8/15/06
- A-8 Traffic Report prepared by McDonough & Rea Asso. Dated 10/12/06
- A-9 Proposed Survey of property prepared by Crest Eng. dated 3/15/06
- A-10 Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan prepared by Crest Eng. dated 5/10/06, Last Revised 2/21/07
- A-11 Floor Plan architecturals prepared by S.Gran Wityk-Architect dated 2/9/07
- A-12 Architecturals prepared by Bach & Clark dated 2/10/07
- A-13 Supplemental Traffic Impact Statement Prepared by McDonough & Rea Asso. Dated 5/4/07
- A-14 Color rendering Ideal Tile @ Riverside Center Prepared by Crest dated 4/8/07
- PB-1 Board Engineer Report dated 4/26/07
- PB-2 Report of Board Planner dated 3/28/07
- PB-3 NJDEP LOI / Line Verification dated 6/18/03
- PB-4 Freehold Soil Certification Letter 5/11/07
- PB-5 MCPB Final Approval dated 7/10/06
- PB-6 Traffic Review Letter dated 5/22/07 Prepared by Jerry Canter

William Mehr, Esq, representing the application. The application is for the first site plan in the Riverside Center Associates project. Mr. Peter Strong of Crest Engineering is sworn in and is accepted as an expert.

Entered into Evidence, Exhibit A-14, color rendering of site landscaping plan prepared by Crest Engineer. Mr. Strong gave a brief over of the project. The project is located on Lot 2.03 in Block 18 and is situated to the east of Route 33 and off of the new Farrington Blvd. Referring to A-14, Mr. Strong points out that the property consists of 14.93 acres. He explained the site, the proposed building location, parking, and landscaping. Attorney Steib asked about installation prior to this site plan would be made a reality. Mr. Mehr will stipulate. Mr. Shafai advised that they are all bonded items.

Mr. Strong explained the location of the detention basin in accordance with storm water management regulations as well as the location of the dry wells and septic.

The lighting shown Mr. Strong went over the proposed lighting plan for the project. Except for security lighting, the lights would be extinguished within thirty (30) minutes of the building closing. No lights would interfere with the closest residential lot, which is approximately 200 feet away. The Exit sign over the side

door would be lit. There is a berm buffer to screen the residential property. Planner Allen Schectel requested the detail of the Exit light. The septic system was discussed and is a contour and not a large mound. The applicant would landscape the contour to have it blend in.

Engineer Matt Shafai's report was discussed. The waiver requested by the applicant is for the loading area spaces. As required by Ordinance, the number is ten (10). Applicant is proposing eight (8). Mr. Strong explained how the operation would suffice with 8. No storage tanks are proposed. Applicant is able to comply with all engineering comments. The hours of operation are 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Planner Allen Schectel went through the Planner's report. He advised that he can not locate stream corridor on the plan to meet buffer requirement. Mr. Strong advised that the corridor does go through the lot and the applicant will meet 100' buffer requirement and would show that on the plan.

Mario Grillo is sworn in. He is the President of Ideal Tile. He advised that there are presently thirty (30) different locations in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Minnesota and New Jersey. The store is a distribution center for ceramic tile. The center supplies the retail stores with tiles and granite slabs. No fabrication is done on the site. The site is for distribution only.

Mr. Grillo advised that the materials are transported from the site to the stores. The factory itself is located in Brazil. This proposed facility is for storage and warehouse. The warehouse would be divided in half. There would be fifteen (15) employees in the warehouse portion and twenty (20) Everest Company (they process the granite product). The office complex contains a display area for architects to view the product. It is not for the public. It is used as a training room for the employees. In the office there would be seven (7) employees. There would be no retail sales, wholesale only. He reiterated that the eight (8) loading docks are sufficient.

Truck activity and hours of deliveries was discussed. No products would be stored outside at any time. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday , 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and Saturday hours are 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Truck activity takes place only during the weekday and not on Saturdays. The facility would have meetings one time per week with store managers. There are four (4) Sunday meetings scheduled per year with the approximately 30 store managers. This is strictly administrative.

Jay Troutman, applicant's traffic engineer is sworn in and having testified before the Board before, was accepted as a professional traffic expert. Mr. Troutman has submitted a traffic report to the Board. He went over the daily, weekly and weekend trips the project would generate. Mr. Canter explained traffic study would be treated as the master plan and as each site comes in they could

monitor the original plan. Mr. Troutman reviewed the generic numbers for this site and agreed they may be on the high side. He asked that in the future, there be a running table so in the long run, they could better assess the situation.

Mr. Canter advised that he has reviewed Mr. Troutman's study and find suffices for the first site. His major concern is access and now that he has seen the plan he finds this to be acceptable and advised the Board that he feels it has adequate access. Mr. Canter reminds all that everything is subject to NJDOT approval.

The applicant discussed the timeline. Mr. Canter requested that the plan shows the location of the site triangles. Mr. Canter asked that the driveway angle be changed for safety reasons. Mr. Canter requested that the sidewalks extend to employee parking for safety. Landing pads should be located outside of the emergency doors. He advised that the "STOP" sign should be relocated. Mr. Canter felt that the number of parking spaces would be sufficient for employees.

Greg Clark of Bach & Clark, was sworn in as a licensed architect. Appearing before the Board in prior applications, his credentials are known to the Board and he is accepted as an expert. He advised that the building would consist of 94,500 s.f. of warehouse used mostly for storage. Loading is located in the center part of the building. The front two-story portion would function as office and administrative offices and a minor portion as a show room for managerial purposes and training purposes. Mr. Mehr advised that the applicant would stipulate that it is not for retails sales.

Mr. Clark explained that each individual granite panel in the front portion of the building would be comprised of four (4) slabs of 5 ft x 7 ft granite. Mr. Clark explains the building size, proposed materials and details. He explained that two signs would be placed on the building. He reported the front facade consists of granite panels. Mr. Clark offered that the building complies with the Town ordinances. Planner Allen Schectel recommended that the left side of building, facing Farrington Blvd., should mirror the side of building facing Rt. 33. The west elevation is to match east where both are visible from the two main roads. The applicant agreed to comply with this request.

Planner Schectel commented that if the showroom is converted into an office, the applicant should come back to Board for additional parking spaces. The signage detail should be on the plans. Landscape would be worked out with applicant and the planner. A "No Further Action" letter from the NJDEP is required.

Chairman Newman opened the application to the public at 10:29 p.m. and seeing no public comment, closed that portion at 10:30 p.m.

Should the Board vote favorably on this application, Attorney Steib read the conditions, including: all landscaping for the site plan would be installed prior to the certificate of occupancy, application to provide detail of security lights at the emergency entrance/exits, obtain a waiver for the 8 loading docks instead of 10 docks, comply with technical comments of the professionals, limits of the flood hazard stream and the buffer be located on the plans, the warehouse is for distribution, no public showroom, no retail sales, no outdoor storage, applicant to comply with Mr. Canter's report, the approval is subject to perfection of the major subdivision, the final architectural drawings are to be submitted to the Board planner, applicant would conform with the technical comments in the planner's letter, applicant would comply with signage comments, NFA from NJDEP, additional planting beds, west side facade would be the same as east facade, etc.

Mr. Kuczynski made a Motion to approve as conditioned and Mr. Kurzman offered a Second. Roll Call Vote: Kuczynski, Kurzman, Blanco, Pinney, Weintraub, Pepe and Newman voted yes to approve.

P07-03 TOTAL STONE – Block 53, Lot 4. Located at Red Valley Road and Trenton-Lakewood Road. 28.7 acres in the BP Zone. Applicant received Preliminary Major Subdivision approval granted on 8/9/06 for a 7-lot subdivision for existing building, private road and 5 new building lots 9/13/06. Applicant returns for Final Approval. Carried from 5/9/07, extension granted to 6/30/07.

Chairman Newman steps down and leaves the courtroom for the application. Vice-Chairman Pepe takes over.

Attorney Steib had reviewed the noticing and found same to be in order to continue the application with the expanded signage. Additional exhibits were entered into evidence as follows:

- A-5 Letter from David Plewa Architect dated 5/31/07 Listing Architectural Features and Standards
- A-6 Affidavit of Notice of Hearing dated 5/17/07
- PB-6 Monmouth County Planning Board Preliminary Approval dated 6/11/07

Kenneth Pape, Esq. represents the applicant. He advised that this application is for Final Major Subdivision approval. The applicant is working on an MOA with the NJDEP. The applicant met with Engineer Shafai and worked out the outstanding issues. Two items had stopped the applicant from going forward. They had asked the Board for three (3) signs and only one could be granted without the variances requested. Mr. Pape advised that the applicant has published notice of this meeting so that they could request that the Board grant the two extra signs. Mr. Pape advised where the extra signs would be located.

Regarding the architecture, Mr. Pape advised that the applicant sat down with the architect and they came up with a set of standards. Mr. Pape would like to sit down with Mr. Coppola to fine tune those standards. The applicant has submitted the Association's declarations. The applicant would like to locate one sign on the highway and at least one at entrance gate. Planner Allen Schectel advised the Board that he does not want to apply retail architectural standards to this type of complex.

Attorney Steib read the conditions of approval including, conditions of the Preliminary approval continues, through the association, the subdivision is to be perfected prior to the receipt of NFA, no construction shall take place without the with NFA issued by the NJDEP, applicant shall comply with technical comments of Engineer and resolve any technical issues with Planner, applicant shall comply with subsequent ordinances adopted by the Township, the Bach and Clark letter as it applies to a business park, industrial buildings with final resolution as the standards to be made by the Board Planner, two signs located at the highway and at the entrance gate, applicant would work with the Millstone Historic Commission as to the street name, etc.

Mr. Kurzman made a Motion to approve and Mr. Weintraub offered a Second. Roll Call Vote: Kurzman, Weintraub, Blanco, Kucziniski, Pinney and Pepe voted yes to approve.

At 10:50 p.m. Ms. Pinney made a Motion to Adjourn and Mr. Kurzman offered a Second and by unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela D'Andrea