

## Plainsboro Township

Amended Preliminary/Final Major  
Subdivision and Site Plan Review  
Application P24-08

Memo Date: 4/2/2025

Meeting Date: 4/21/2025

# Planning Board Review Memo

Name of Applicant: PFV Holding LLC and PFV Holdings Land LLC

Property Owner: Same

Type of Application: Amended Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision and Site Plan Review

Name of Project: Princeton Forrestal Village Residential Project

Property Location: College Road West and Route 1  
(Block 104, Lots 1.03, 1.05, 1.06 and 1.07)

Zone: PMUD -- Planned Unit Development District

Present Use of Property: Mixed Retail/Commercial, Office, Restaurants, Educational, Swim Club, and related parking and site improvements

Adjacent Land Uses:

North:	Undeveloped Princeton Nurseries Property
South:	Eden Autism Services
East:	Existing Princeton Forrestal Village and Route 1
West:	Princeton Windrows and Carnegie Post Acute Care at Princeton

---

## **Background**

The Princeton Forrestal Village (PFV) was approved by the Township in June 1985 as a planned upscale mixed commercial development, including a hotel, retail shops, restaurants, and offices. Since opening in 1986, the center has struggled as a retail center; first as a high-end retail center, then for a period as a retail factory outlet. During the period 2006-2008 two restaurants (Salt Creek Grill and Ruth's Chris) and Cando Fitness were added, making the center more of a mixed commercial center with less emphasis on retail and more emphasis on restaurants and office uses. In 2016 the Cando Fitness health club closed after less than ten years of operation. Since that time,

leased retail floor space at the center has continued to shrink, as has office occupancy. Today the center has several vacant store fronts and vacant office space.

Over the years there has been talk about the need for residential development at the PFV to help bolster the retail and restaurant market for this center. Previous owners of the center shared that perspective, explaining how a well-designed residential development could be built in a manner that would not only provide a high quality residential environment, but would enhance the overall design and appearance of the center; providing an enhanced pedestrian environment around the proposed buildings and open spaces, and would provide a permanent neighborhood population of several hundred residents that could patronize existing and new restaurants, and neighborhood serving shops and services.

In 2014, the Planning Board approved a site plan and subdivision for a residential development at the center which included 394 multifamily rental units in three separate buildings (P14-09). In 2016 the Planning Board approved the subdivision of one of the two lots approved in 2014, into two separate lots so that each of the approved buildings would sit on its own lot (P16-03). While all the issues related to this residential project were largely addressed, the one issue that remained unresolved was related to parking. Since the project was to be built in phases, a parking plan was developed to be implemented as the project proceeded. There was a requirement that a parking analysis be completed in association with the building permit for the third building, to demonstrate that the first and second levels of the parking structure would be adequate to support the project and that such parking would be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the third building. The third level of the parking structure was to be built only if subsequent analysis determined a need for such parking. It is staff's understanding that the costs related to meeting the aforementioned parking obligation resulted in the overall project never proceeding to construction.

### **Project Description**

The applicant and its professional design team, Minno & Wasko Architects and Planners, and Van Note-Harvey Division of Pennoni site/civil engineers, have designed this project to be substantially consistent with the high-quality site design and architecture as the project that was approved by the Planning Board in October 2014. The applicant indicates that, compared to the 2014 project, what is now proposed offers increased public amenities, pedestrian improvements, building efficiencies, and refinement of architectural details.

The proposed development will contain 394 new residential units (same as the 2014 development) to be developed in three phases. Buildings A and B will each contain 160 units and Building C, located where the existing Market Hall is located, will contain 74 units. The buildings will contain a mix of studio, one, and two-bedroom market rate apartment units, as well as a mix of one, two and three-bedroom affordable apartment units, totaling sixty-seven (67) units, which will comply with the State's affordable housing standards (Uniform Housing Affordability Controls or UHAC). Note the proposed affordable housing component represents an increase as compared to the prior 2014 approval (from 50 units to 67 units or from 12.7% to 17% of the total number of units proposed).

Each building will include communal indoor residential amenity space, as well as active outdoor amenity space. The amenities offered include an elegant hotel style lobby, upscale club suite, state-of-the-art fitness center, yoga room, residential co-working areas, and a resort style pool with outdoor grills and lounging areas.

The structures will be four stories in height, not exceeding a maximum height of 60 feet, with a basement level of structured parking below. Factoring in the scale, materials and architectural details found within the Princeton Forrestal Village development and the surrounding area, the exterior materials for the project are to include cast stone-veneer, a variety of brick-veneer, fiber cement siding panels, dark colored vinyl residential windows, PVC Trim, and dimensional fiber-glass roof shingles. While these materials reflect a neutral palette that complements its surroundings, contemporary architectural elements can be seen in the design of the entrance canopies, varied cornice lines, lighting, and the overall detailing of the building elevations.

Ample private structured parking will be provided for the residents internal to each building, totaling a combined 428 residential parking spaces, as well as convenient surface parking spaces located adjacent to each building. The proposed plan indicates that the project as proposed will result in providing a parking supply equal to the parking requirements at the PFV, excluding the parking provided at the Westin Hotel (Such calculation includes the parking space bonuses allowed under the State and Township EV regulations that count each EV space as equivalent to two parking spaces).

The site plan also allows for open landscaped green spaces and continuous sidewalks around the community connecting the residents to the existing retail, restaurants, and public transportation. The proposed site plan includes several new public streetscape improvements as well as a new design for the public plaza area adjacent to Rockingham Row. The existing landscaped berms along College Road West will be redefined with new site landscaping and plantings while preserving existing trees where possible. At Main Street the existing inner row of existing oak trees are proposed to remain, thereby maintaining much of the existing tree canopy at the Main Street entrance to the development off College Road West. New sidewalks and street trees allow for greater pedestrian connectivity and a new pedestrian entrance located at the intersection of College Road and Seminary Drive will connect to Lionsgate Dr. as well as offer greater connectivity to the future mixed-use Princeton Nurseries development site located across Seminary Drive.

This project will be supportive of the existing retail, restaurants, hotel and offices in the center, will reinforce the pedestrian link to The Windrows along Main Street allowing a safe, beautiful walking experience into the Forrestal Village, as well as provide a pleasant, safe pedestrian connection to the future Princeton Nurseries mixed-use development across the intersection of College Road West/Seminary Drive and Nursery Road immediately to the north.

Regarding the proposed subdivision, the applicant seeks to have Lot 1.03 remain for proposed Building A; Lot 1.06 will also remain, but increase in lot area in the northerly direction (portion of area taken from Lot 1.07) for proposed Building B. The remaining

portion of Lot 1.07 will be consolidated back into Lot 1.05. A new lot is proposed and will be created around the existing building (Market Hall, to be demolished) for proposed Building C.

The applicant has requested an extended vesting period of five (5) years on this application, running from the date on which the resolution of the amended plan approval is adopted. According to research by the Planning Board Attorney, the vesting on the initial October 20, 2014 approval of this project (P14-09) expired on October 20, 2019. That said, the Planning Board may retroactively extend the vesting period for whatever period it deems reasonable pursuant to Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-52), taking into consideration the number of dwelling units and nonresidential floor area, economic conditions, and comprehensiveness of the development. In this instance, the applicant states that this extended vesting period is appropriate and reasonable given the size and complexity of the proposed development, i.e., the number of proposed units, current economic conditions, and the applicant's comprehensive goal to integrate the proposed development with the rest of Princeton Forrestal Village.

The applicant notes that the proposed development furthers the intent and purpose of the Township Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance, which were both amended in 2014 to allow the 2014 residential development at the PFV to be approved.

*See applicant's Rider to Application and Exhibit A, Design Narrative for additional details on the project.*

### **Site Plan and Subdivision Check List Waivers**

The applicant has requested ten (10) site plan check list waivers and has submitted a list that identifies the requested waivers with an explanation and justification for each. DRC/Staff have reviewed the requested waivers and are of the opinion that such waivers are reasonable and support their being granted.

### **DRC/Staff Comments & Recommendations**

#### **A. Planning and Zoning**

1. The current PMUD Zone regulations permit a use category identified as "Mixed-Use Multiple Dwellings" (§101-137P) and a section entitled "Evaluation Standards and Criteria" (§101-142) where 18 project evaluation standards are identified and described. Based on staff's review of the proposed plans and discussions between staff and the applicant, staff is satisfied that such use and evaluation standards applicable to the proposed development have been adequately addressed.
2. In response to the applicant's request for extended vesting pursuant to the provisions of the MLUL, staff takes no issue regarding this request.

**B. General Subdivision and Site Plan Issues**

1. All easements and rights in favor of the Township shall be expressed in deeds and grants suitable for recording at the County Clerk's Office, the form of which shall be approved by the Planning Board Attorney and the description in which shall be approved by the Township Engineer.
2. Given the condition of the existing roadway pavement on College Road West and internal to the site, and the magnitude of the project, it appears that College Road West and the internal roadways will require significant restoration including resurfacing and re-stripping. **DRC/Staff recommends** that the applicant assess the roadway conditions and amend the plans to include the proposed roadway restoration limits for further review by Planning Board staff. In addition, the stop signs and stop bars shall be relocated as necessary to accommodate the proposed crosswalk modifications in accordance with MUTCD requirements.
3. In the application document labeled "Rider to Application," the applicant mentions that they are seeking to develop the property in phases. No phasing plan has been submitted with the application. The applicant indicates that a complete construction staging and logistics plan shall be filed with the Township by their contractor when seeking permits for the proposed project and approved by Township staff.

**C. Residential Site Improvement Standard (RSIS) Issues**

The applicant's engineer has indicated that the project complies with RSIS standards. The applicant shall provide a written compliance report demonstrating conformance to the Residential Site Improvements Standards (RSIS), including but not limited to the following items:

1. Sidewalk locations and widths
2. Right-of-way, cartway and parking lane widths
3. Average daily vehicle computation and analysis
4. Storm system design and construction
5. Storm water management design and construction
6. Water system and fire hydrant design and construction
7. Sanitary collection system design and construction
8. Parking requirements and dimensions
9. Roadway alignment and grade standards
10. Requirements for curbing and pavement shoulders
11. Bikeways
12. Underground utilities
13. Street and traffic signs and sign locations
14. Sight lines / easements

**D. Landscaping/Open Space, Screening, and Lighting Issues**

1. The proposed site includes a significant number of semi-mature (less than 12 inches in caliper) and mature trees (more than 12 inches in caliper) that were planted in the early to mid-1980s when the Princeton Forrestal Village was first developed. Given the nature of this project and the need to remove most of the existing trees on the site, which was the case as well back in 2014 under the prior approved plan, staff has concerns about the quantity, quality, and size of the landscaping proposed throughout the project, but particularly within the areas most visible to the public along College Road West and Main Street. In response to this concern and consistent with how this issue was handled under the prior approved plan, the applicant proposes to preserve as many of the existing mature shade trees along College Road West as possible, in addition to planting new shade trees along this area that will be a minimum of 4 to 5 inches in caliper at planting time.
2. As noted above, the applicant intends to make every effort to preserve existing mature trees wherever possible, however -- where such efforts have been made and the trees involved do not survive, the applicant has agreed to replace such trees with trees of similar species, measuring 4 to 5 inches in caliper at planting time, and has added a note to the plan accordingly.
3. Along Main Street, between Lions Gate Drive and College Road West, the applicant proposes to preserve the line of mature existing Oak trees, on both sides of the street, between the existing sidewalk and the curb. Staff identified two missing trees in this area on the north side of Main Street. **DRC/Staff recommends** that the missing Oak trees be replaced with Oak trees of the same species having a minimum 4-to-5-inch caliper at planting time. The applicant has agreed to this recommendation and has revised the plans accordingly.
4. The proposed landscape plan identifies four new tree plantings on Main Street along the frontage of Building C. There are currently three 10-to-12-inch caliper Honey Locust trees along this portion of the site, one of which is proposed to be removed in association with the new building. The four new trees that applicant shows along this frontage are to be 2½ inch to 3-inch caliper at planting. **DRC/Staff recommends** that such new trees, like the new trees proposed along the College Road West frontage of the site, be a minimum of 4-to-5-inch caliper, which would be more consistent with the size of the existing trees along the Building C frontage and along the frontage of the opposite side of Main Street from Building C. The applicant has agreed to this recommendation and has revised the plans accordingly.
5. The applicant has proposed two areas along College Road West involving electric transformers serving Buildings A and B. **DRC/Staff recommends** that such transformers or other utility equipment be a dark green color (Sherwin Williams Rock Garden Green, SW# 6195 or equivalent) and be screened by high quality fencing and/or landscaping to reduce the visibility of

such equipment as seen from College Road West to the satisfaction of Planning Board staff in consultation with the affected utility company. On the plan immediately to the south of Building C, there are utility structures that are not labeled. According to the existing conditions plan, there are existing electric utility structures in this same area. Such existing and/or new utility equipment shall be treated as noted above. All other ground-mounted equipment, if any, shall be adequately screened to the satisfaction of Township staff in consultation with the affected utility company, if applicable. The applicant has agreed to this recommendation and has added a note to the plans accordingly.

6. The applicant's plan shows emergency generators located along the College Road West frontage of Buildings A and B. According to the applicant's architect, the proposed location of the generators will include some type of screen wall feature. In the event such screen walls do not fully screen views of the generators, **DRC/Staff recommend** additional screening treatment be provided to the satisfaction of Planning Board staff. Additionally, prior to installation, the applicant shall provide evidence that the proposed generators comply with the NJDEP noise restrictions (N.J.A.C. 7:29). The applicant has agreed to this recommendation.
7. A review of the applicant's architectural plans (Sheet A-6, Roof Plan) indicates that there will be some rooftop equipment. What is unclear to staff in reviewing the plans is whether such rooftop equipment will be visible from ground level or whether it is located behind and below a roof feature that will effectively screen all views of such equipment from ground level. Without knowing which applies, **DRC/Staff recommends** that any rooftop equipment be located and screened from view from ground level.
8. The Statistics Chart provided indicates light levels with averages from 0.7-0.8 footcandles, which exceeds the typical average of 0.40-0.45 footcandles for residential street lighting. The Applicant shall discuss the need for the increased light levels.

#### **E. Signage Issues**

1. The applicant's plans include identification signage for the project at four locations. Sheets L-2 and L-3 identify the location of each of the signs (College Road West or CRW at Village Boulevard, CRW at Main Street, CRW at pedestrian gateway structure, and CRW at Houghton Lane). Sheets L-12 and L-13 identify details related to the proposed identification signs. **DRC/Staff recommends** the notes associated with the sign details on Sheet L-12 need to be clarified to indicate which sign the specific details relate to and which plan sheet (i.e., L-2 or L-3) identifies the location of the sign. The applicant has agreed to make these revisions in the final plans.

2. In 2014, at the DRC meeting on the plan being proposed at that time, mention was made of the need by emergency services personnel to be able to distinguish each of the three buildings. In the Planning Board Review Memo of the 2014 plan, the applicant was asked to consider options for building identification that would achieve this. The applicant at that time responded indicating that they met with various Township staff on this matter, and that each building will be clearly identified using emergency access signage that is distinguishable between the buildings and type of access entry. They mention that the final details of such treatment will be subject to the review and approval of the Township. **DRC/Staff recommends** the current applicant likewise consider this matter and arrange to meet with Township Fire Official and, as appropriate, Fire District personnel, to determine a mutually acceptable option to address the matter. The applicant has agreed to this recommendation.
3. The applicant's plans indicate that all MUTCD type traffic signage will comply with the Princeton Forrestal Center (PFC) sign details for such signage. **DRC/Staff recommends** the applicant utilize the Type B PFC sign detail for all MUTCD signs and the Type A PFC sign detail only for two-sided MUTCD signs. The plans shall be revised accordingly.

**F. Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues**

1. The applicant has proposed sidewalks within the proposed development, all of which are identified as being five feet in width, which is the minimum required in the Township Code (§85-22). In the 2014 plan, sidewalks were generally five feet in width and adjoined a four-foot-wide decorative paver area that adjoined streets/parking lot drive-aisle curbs. The effect of this was that of increasing the useable walkway area width to nine feet for areas outside the tree grates. Elsewhere in the project, where the sidewalks did not adjoin a four-foot-wide decorative paver area, the sidewalks were widened to six feet in width. Such width is consistent with the sidewalk width standard required for sidewalks adjoining multifamily buildings in the Princeton Nurseries development located north of College Road West. **DRC/Staff recommends** this same approach for the current plan, recommending the plan be revised accordingly. The applicant agrees with this recommendation and shall revise the plans accordingly.
2. The applicant has proposed to provide four feet square tree grates for all the proposed street trees adjoining proposed sidewalks. The selected tree grates must be flexible such that the opening in the grate for the tree is readily expandable. It is staff's understanding that the tree grate specified in the plans by the applicant's landscape architects, MBC, does not comply with this requirement. The model information for the revised tree grate shall be added to the plans and the final detail for the tree grates shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Board Engineer's office.



3. The current plan identifies an eight-foot-wide concrete sidewalk along the perimeter of the site replacing the existing bituminous asphalt paved bikeway that extends from Village Boulevard on the south side of the property to Village Boulevard on the north side of the property. Since such pathway was initially planned and constructed to function as a bikeway, where bituminous asphalt paving was chosen as the best option from a durability, maintenance, and suitability for bikeway usage perspective, **DRC/Staff recommends** that the proposed pathway be bituminous asphalt and not concrete as noted on the current plans. The applicant agrees with this recommendation and shall revise the plans accordingly.
4. The applicant shall provide “Share the Road” signs at all vehicular points of entry into the PFV, subject to the review and approval of the Planning Board Engineer’s office. The details of such signs, which shall comply with the Type B alternative MUTCD sign detail for the PFC, are shown on the current plan set (Sheet CE-20). The applicant agrees with this plan revision and has revised the plans accordingly.
5. There is no mention of resident bicycle storage in the applicant’s plans. **Staff recommend** that the applicant revise the plans to identify bicycle storage inside each of the parking garages of the three buildings adequate to meet expected demand and based on current industry standards for such storage in multifamily dwelling buildings.

BALANCE OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## **G. Parking**

1. Below are tables indicating the parking requirements and parking supply for the subject project:

<b>Parking Requirement Summary</b>	<b>Required Parking (Spaces)</b>
Current PFV Site – Non-Residential Uses per 2014 Agreement & confirmed by 6/6/23 CME Review	1,675
Building C Removal	-180 (From 6/6/2023 Review)
Building A (300), Building B (300), and Building C (141) Parking Requirement - RSIS	+741
Building A (-30), B (-30), and C (-14) EV Credit (10% of residential requirement)	-74
<b>Total Parking Spaces Required for Entire Site Including Residential EV Credits</b>	<b>2,162</b>

<b>Parking Supply Summary</b>	<b>Proposed Parking (Spaces)</b>
Current PFV Site – Non-Residential Uses	1,623 (Existing per Updated Parking Analysis dated March 5, 2025)
Removal of Existing Parking Spaces for Residential Buildings A and B footprint	-184
Land-banked parking in Lot F Salt Creek Grill	+40
Total Building A	+258
Total Building B (including Lot K reconfiguration of Removing 121 parking spaces and installing 252 parking spaces)	+343
Total Building C	+82
<b>Total Parking Spaces Proposed for Entire Site</b>	<b>2,162</b>

The project includes 112 EV spaces within the three parking structures as well as within the surface lots. The EV spaces within the buildings (A-26+B-26+C-12=64) will be constructed when the structures are built and the make-ready spaces, located within the surface lots (A-19+B-19+C-10=48), will be built per Township and State ordinances.

Based on the above tables, the proposed parking supply is equal to the parking requirement for the entire site.

2. The Applicant's Engineer shall indicate on the plans each parking space outside of the buildings allocated to residential Buildings A, B, and C.
3. The Applicant's Engineer shall revise the Site Plans and Architectural Plans to provide one (1) additional ADA parking space, where four (4) are required

and three (3) are provided, and to provide two (2) accessible sized EV parking spaces for Building C.

4. The Site Plans and Architectural Plans shall be updated to reflect the parking calculations for Building C. Additionally, should any revisions to the Site Plans or Architectural Plans occur, then the proposed ADA and EV parking spaces shall be revised to account for changes to same.
5. Given the nearly 400 dwelling units proposed and the likelihood that many of the residents will frequently be receiving goods by various delivery services (Amazon, FedEx, UPS, DoorDash, Grubhub), the provision of convenient reserved short-term parking for such vehicles will be important to preventing vehicle circulation and parking issues/conflicts. **Staff recommend** that the applicant explain to the Planning Board how the demand for delivery vehicle parking will be addressed under the proposed plan.

#### **H. Traffic Impact and Circulation**

The applicant's engineer has provided a traffic analysis for the 394 residential units based upon the 11th edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual with and has assessed the removal of the 61,869 SF Health Club and the removal of the 10,000 sf of Retail associated with Building C and notes that the proposed project would have a net reduction of 123 trips in the AM Peak Hour and 221 trips in the PM Peak Hour from the 2014 traffic analysis which projected an overall Level of Service D at the off-site studied intersections. Staff takes no exception to the traffic analysis done by the applicant's engineer.

#### **I. Grading, Drainage and Storm Water Management Issues**

1. The applicant has agreed to provide a Drainage, Conservation, Maintenance and Access Easement in favor of Plainsboro Township and the County of Middlesex for the stormwater management system. The deed of easement and metes and bounds description shall be subject to the review and approval of the Township Attorney and Township Engineer. A computer printout closure report shall be submitted for the easement.
2. The Applicant has agreed that the Maintenance Plan and any future revisions will be recorded upon the deed of record for the property on which the maintenance described in the maintenance plan must be undertaken. The form of same shall be approved by the Township Attorney prior to recording the same with the Middlesex County Clerk's Officer per Section 85-28 J.

#### **J. Water Supply and Distribution Issues**

1. A report prepared by a professional engineer licensed in the State of New Jersey including calculations of the anticipated water demand has been submitted by the Applicant. The following additional items shall be provided:

- a. Documentation from New Jersey American Water as to the availability of existing water systems or proposed systems in the area to serve the needed flows.
  - b. Test data and calculations demonstrating that the required flows and pressures can be provided from the existing system.
2. The Applicant is responsible for obtaining a permit from the NJDEP BWSE, if applicable.
3. The design and adequacy of the fire suppression systems and the delineation of fire lanes are subject to the review of the Fire Subcode Official.

**K. Sanitary Sewer and Solid Waste Handling Issues**

1. A report prepared by a licensed New Jersey Professional Engineer including a calculation of the anticipated sanitary flows to be generated by the proposed development has been submitted by the Applicant. The Applicant shall submit information to confirm the adequacy of the downstream conveyance system to accept the proposed flows and the availability of facilities to accept and treat the flow.
2. The Applicant is responsible for obtaining a Treatment Works Approval from NJDEP.
3. The Applicant is responsible for obtaining approval from the South Brunswick Sewerage Authority.
4. According to the applicant, all solid waste and recyclable materials storage shall occur inside the proposed residential buildings. Residents will have access to a solid waste and recyclable materials disposal room on each floor of the respective buildings. Within such room there will be containers to dispose of solid waste and recyclable materials. The solid waste and recyclable materials to be disposed of in the trash rooms will be collected by property management personnel for pick-up by a licensed recyclable materials waste hauler under contract with the property owner. Solid waste or recyclable materials shall not be stored or visible outside the proposed buildings except for short durations prior to scheduled pick-up. The applicant indicates that they will coordinate with the waste hauler to identify appropriate location(s) for such temporary storage. Additionally, the applicant shall indicate where the garbage and delivery trucks will perform their pick-up and drop-off for Building's 'A' and 'B'. The areas shall be dimensioned and able to accommodate said vehicles for Building's 'A', 'B', and 'C'.

**L. Construction Issues**

1. The applicant shall discuss the provisions for the management of construction activity and construction vehicles on-site during the construction of the proposed improvements, and provide detailed hauling, staging, and circulation plans for the project to be reviewed and approved by Township Staff.
2. As noted in comment B.3. above, no phasing plan has been submitted with the application. The applicant indicates that a complete construction staging and logistics plan will be filed with the Township by their contractor when seeking permits for the proposed project. **DRC/Staff recommend** that the sequence of construction of the three buildings, as well as the site infrastructure and improvements, be developed and reviewed during the resolution compliance process in association with the required construction staging/logistics plan and hauling plan for the project.
3. Plans for model unit areas, if any, shall be provided.
4. The pool, recreation facilities and all structures are subject to the review of the Township Construction Code Official.
5. Barrier Free Sub-code compliance is subject to Construction Code Official review and approval.

**M. Affordable Housing**

1. The applicant has agreed to provide 67 units in the development as a set aside for affordable housing. Planning Board staff recommend that the following minimum conditions apply to such set aside:
  - a. The affordable units shall be constructed and administered in accordance with New Jersey's Uniform Housing Affordability Controls or UHAC (N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.1 *et seq.*) and shall comply with all State barrier free accessibility requirements.
  - b. The 67 units shall be interspersed among the market rate units in all three buildings and shall contain the bedroom mix and mix of very low-, low- and moderate-income units as required under UHAC.
  - c. The 67 units will be constructed in accordance with the phase-in requirements set forth in State and Township regulations in effect at the time of approval, or such other phase-in schedule as may be agreed to between the developer and the Township.

2. The developer shall enter into a contract with Plainsboro's Administrative Agent ("AA") or such other qualified AA as the State prescribes and shall pay the AA's fee for affirmative marketing, advertising, and income qualification services.

**N. Miscellaneous Issues**

1. In 2014, the applicant was asked to comment on the provisions for emergency services access to the three residential buildings and their parking garages. The applicant at the time indicated that this matter was being discussed with Township staff, including members of the Township Police Department. The final details of the emergency access system were to be coordinated with and subject to the approval of appropriate Township emergency services personnel. **DRC/Staff recommends** that the current applicant also be required to follow a similar process to address this matter. The applicant agrees to this recommendation.
2. The applicant shall enter into a Developer's Agreement with the Township that is acceptable in form and substance to the Township Planning Board Attorney and Township Attorney. Such agreement shall, among other matters, memorialize conditions related to this project's affordable housing component, the implementation of the overall parking requirements for the Princeton Forrestal Village related to this application, and to the required restoration of College Road West as mentioned in Comment B.2. of this memo.
3. Some of the building elevation drawings in the plan set appear to be mislabeled. **DRC/Staff recommends** they be relabeled as follows: 1) Building A North Elevation (Sheet A-7) should be relabeled as the South Elevation and Building A South Elevation (Sheet A-8) should be relabeled as the North Elevation, 2) Building B North Elevation (Sheet A-9) should be relabeled as the South Elevation and Building B South Elevation (Sheet A-10) should be relabeled as the North Elevation, 3) Building C South Elevation (Sheet A-11) should be relabeled as the North Elevation and Building C North Elevation (Sheet A-12) should be relabeled as the South Elevation. The applicant has agreed to make these revisions in the final plans.
4. The applicant shall discuss the adequacy of the proposed indoor and outdoor recreational facilities to serve the residents of the proposed project, including how the recreational needs for resident children in the development will be served. When this project was before the Planning Board in 2014, the applicant noted that the project was not designed for children and is targeted to young professionals and empty nesters.

Since no playground or similar facilities are shown on the proposed plans, and as was required under the 2014 plan approval, to ensure compatibility between the residents in the development and the recreational facilities provided, the **DRC/Staff recommend** the applicant shall monitor the number

and ages of children in the project to determine whether recreational facilities specifically for children are needed. Prior to the release of the final CO for each of the three buildings in the project, the applicant shall provide such information to the Department of Planning & Zoning for review. If the Township determines that additional recreational facilities for children are necessary, the applicant shall proceed to provide such facilities without formal application to the Board. The applicant shall submit a plan and description of the proposed facilities to the Township explaining how such facilities fulfill the recreational needs of the resident children. Such facilities shall be ADA compliant.

**O. Other Agency Approval Issues**

1. The applicant shall discuss approvals by all other agencies or organizations having jurisdiction, including the following:
  - a. D&R Canal Commission,
  - b. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection,
  - c. New Jersey Department of Transportation,
  - d. Stony Brook Regional Sewerage Authority,
  - e. South Brunswick Township,
  - f. Freehold Soil Conservation District,
  - g. Middlesex County Planning Board,
  - h. Princeton University Real Estate Office,
  - i. All other agencies having jurisdiction.
2. Copies of applications and approval, certifications, waivers or letters of no concern, as may be required by all agencies having jurisdiction, shall be provided as a condition of final approval prior to release of the final plans by the Department of Planning and Zoning.
3. Township offices and staff that may have review jurisdiction involving this application or improvements related thereto, include:
  - Planning and Zoning Department: Ron Yake, Planner/Zoning Officer  
799-0909, ext. 1503
  - Planning Board Engineer's Office: Louis Ploskonka, CME Associates  
732-727-8000
  - Code Enforcement/Building Division: Brian Miller, Construction Official  
799-0909, ext. 1203  
Bill Gorka, Fire Official  
799-0909, ext. 1208
  - County Health Department: County Inspector  
799-0909, ext. 1219

Any approval shall be conditioned upon the submission of revised plans in accordance with the above comments; proof of approval or waivers from all other agencies having jurisdiction; the construction of offsite improvements, if deemed necessary by the Township Committee; the payment of any outstanding escrow fees and property taxes; the provision of an estimate for the cost of improvements to the Township in order that performance guarantees and inspection; fees can be calculated; and compliance with all applicable state and local affordable housing requirements.

**MLUL Clock:**

Application Completeness: 12/8/24

Planning Board Action: 4/21/25 (MLUL time extension granted by applicant)