

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
APRIL 21, 2025 MEETING
MINUTES

MEETING HELD:

Monday, April 21, 2025 at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Building Court room

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER ATTENDANCE:

Ed Yates, Cary Spiegel, Peter Cantú, Arthur Lehrhaupt, Richard Keevey, Joseph Greer, Sanjana Raturi and Reeta Sharma were present.

Sanjeev Agarwal, Jetal Doshi and Sharmila Maheshwari were absent.

TOWNSHIP/CONSULTANT ATTENDANCE:

Bonnie N. Flynn, Director of Planning and Community Development; Ron Yake, Township Planner/Zoning Officer; Lou Ploskonka and Abd Elazeem Youssef, CME Associates, Planning Board Engineers; Trishka W. Cecil, Mason, Griffin & Pierson, P. C., Planning Board Attorney and Josi Easter, Board Secretary.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:

There were 11 members of the public present including the applicant.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chair Lehrhaupt called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and read the certification of meeting notices.

ROLL CALL:

Yates	- yes	Keevey	- yes	Raturi	- arrived at
Spiegel	- yes	Agarwal	- absent	Maheshwari	- 7:05
Cantú	- yes	Doshi	- absent	Sharma	- absent
Lehrhaupt	- yes	Greer	- yes		- yes

P24-08 PFV HOLDINGS LLC. AND PFV HOLDINGS LAND LLC. – AMENDED PRELIMINARY AND FINAL MAJOR SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN REVIEW, BLOCK 104, LOTS 1.03, 1.05, 1.06 AND 1.07

Christopher DeGrazia, Esq., Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, attorney for the applicant PFV Holdings LLC. and PFV Holding Land LLC.. The application is for an amended preliminary and final site plan and subdivision with extended vesting in connection with a residential development in the Princeton Forrestal Village(PFV). PFV was created in 1985 and constructed in 1986. At the time, it was approved as a planned upscale mixed commercial development. However, it never took off as a retail center. The town and owner worked to revitalize the center and bring in a residential component. There were changes made to the code and eventually in 2014 the previous applicant received site plan

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

subdivision approval for a residential development. The development had three lots with a building on each and a total of 394 residential units. However, for a variety of reasons it was never built. This amended plan is better than the original with improvements to the public amenities for the residents; increased pedestrian improvements and connectivity between the site and other sites and building efficiency and overall architectural design. The number of units is the same at 394 units within three buildings. In place of one of the new buildings, they will be demolishing an old commercial building that is underutilized. Another change is that they will be adding electric charging stations in accordance with the ordinance and the number of Affordable Housing Units has increased from 50 to 67 units.

Trishka W. Cecil, Mason, Griffin & Pierson, P.C., Planning Board Attorney stated that the Board can take jurisdiction since she reviewed the notice and everything is in order.

Ms. Cecil swore in the applicant's witnesses as follows:

- Stuart Johnson, AIA – Minno Wasko, Architects and Planners
- Thomas Bauer, Landscape Architect – Melillo Bauer Carman Landscape Architecture
- Ralph Petrella, PE – Pennoni
- Karl Pehnke, PE – Traffic Engineer, Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc.

Mr. Johnson gave an overview of his credentials and without objection Chair Lehrhaupt accepted him as an expert.

Mr. Johnson stated that they have a new vision for the PFV redevelopment. The prior approval was granted for a multi-family development of three four-story buildings with 394 units and internal structured parking with site improvements that included pedestrian circulation, landscaping, sidewalks and street trees. They believed that a new multifamily unit development would help revitalize and support the retail and restaurants in the center. However, the project was never built. What they are proposing now maintains the majority but improves it by making it a more pedestrian-friendly streetscape experience.

Mr. Johnson indicated that the first exhibit is an aerial view of the site which depicts the current conditions. The site is 35 acres located at the intersection of College Road West and Route 1. The existing uses on the campus are mixed-use retail, commercial office; restaurants, both fast casual and formal dining; hospitality and hotel use; educational; health club, which is currently vacant, and surface parking that supports those uses. Slide 3 is a street view from Main Street showing it being flanked by a double row of oak trees that they are preserving. The next slide shows the walking path with an existing berm that they want to maintain or recreate to screen the surface parking. The following slide is at Seminary Drive facing south with the Princeton Nurseries behind. It is a wide intersection, and the goal is to break down the scale and introduce human-scale elements by creating a pedestrian gateway entrance that is safe and inviting to connect the two mixed-use campuses. Slide 7 is a view looking south from Main Street to Rockingham Row and the plaza showing the Can Do Fitness which is currently vacant and not conducive to rehab. They will demo the building and construct a new four-story apartment building with basement level parking. They intend to improve the public plaza at Rockingham Row that connects to the alley where the shops are. The improvements will be more pedestrian friendly and an inviting accessible access to the shops that in turn, should provide for more

APRIL 21, 2025

successful retail. Slide 8 is a view looking west from Rockingham Row showing the ramp system to the public plaza. The next slide is a view looking east showing a series of steps and the complicated ramp system which they propose to improve for better circulation. The subsequent slide shows the view facing south of the access to the structured parking.

Mr. Johnson specified that Sheet A3 of the architectural drawing set is the ground floor plan. The application is for three new multifamily buildings identified as Buildings A, B & C. They are each four stories with basement level parking. Both buildings A and B are comprised of 160 units. Building C, a modified U shaped building, has 74 residential apartments. In total they have 394 apartments, which is the same number that was previously approved. The unit mix breakdown is 26 studio, 224 one-bedroom, 130 two-bedroom and 14 three-bedroom apartments with 67 affordable units that comply with the UHAC regulations. The affordable unit breakdown is 13 one-bedroom, 42 two-bedrooms and 14 three-bedrooms. They are spread throughout each building and designed in an inclusionary manner. In the basement level of each building there is structured parking. Building A has 175 parking spaces, of which 26 are eligible EV ready, and 50 secured bicycle parking spaces. The buildings are fully accessible with elevator access to every floor that comply with chapter 11 of the international building code. Building B has 175 parking spaces and 50 secured bicycle spaces. Building C has 82 structured parking spaces and 16 bicycle parking spaces. Each building provides greater than a one to one parking underneath the building and the remainder is convenient surface parking adjacent to each of the buildings.

Mr. Johnson stated that the main residential lobby for each of the buildings is located on Main Street. Each have a secured key fob access to a ground floor lobby, mail, leasing etc. The indoor amenities include a clubroom, state of the art fitness center, game room, co-working and networking type spaces. Each of the buildings will have an open air court yard for passive and active recreational amenities. Buildings A & B will have a pool within the courtyard that will have direct access from the building as well as have passive amenities like outdoor dining and grilling. The following slide was of images depicting the Lobby lounge that is akin to what is found in a small boutique hotel. A few examples were shown of the outdoor amenities like the fire pits, outdoor dining, bocci and a small resort style pool with chaise lounge chairs. The 2nd floor plan is consistent with the 3rd and 4th except for the two story ceiling height opened to the space below. Each building will have a flat roof. However, they designed them to have a mono roof truss or solo roof truss which when walking or driving around the community will look like a pitched roof. Therefore, the roof itself will screen the mechanical units for the building. On the roof will be condenser units that are 42" high as well as a few rooftop package units that are 8' high that heat and cool all the common areas of the building. They are all below the parapet of the mono roof truss that is 11' or 12' in height.

Mr. Johnson continued with a slide looking east from College Road West. It is the main entrance to the campus, and they are preserving the inner row of oak trees. The new sidewalk is where the sidewalk is today which permits for 10 + feet between the sidewalk and the building to allow for perimeter landscaping to soften where the building meets grade. It is a wider right of way in order to get a more inviting experience, and the human scale is broken down more at the base of the building. The exterior architecture is defined with distinct architectural tower elements at the corner of the building and at the

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

roof level is the mono roof truss which has asphalt shingle detail. Predominately the buildings will be masonry red brick veneer buildings with a rose brick as a subtle accent. They are also using several vertical fiber cement panels in different colors to provide accent and relief. The monument signs will flank the entrance on Main Street. They are proposing two entrance canopy signs at the entrance of each of the residential buildings with dimensional channel letters affixed to the edge of the canopies that will identify the address or name of the community. The green features of the buildings are energy star appliances; energy star light fixtures; auto on/off movement sensors in the parking garage, water fixtures will be low flow; programable thermostat etc.

Thomas Bauer, Landscape Architect, Melillo Bauer Carman Landscape Architecture gave an overview of his qualifications and was accepted without objection by Chair Lehrhaupt.

Mr. Bauer indicated that exhibit A-2 has 28 slides. The 1st slide is showing the 3 buildings. The 2nd slide is of Building A surrounded by College Road West, Main Street, Lionsgate Drive and Village Boulevard. It shows the bicycle path and the asphalt walkway that will remain or improved upon along College Road West. On Main Street it displays two rows of Oak Trees that they are preserving the innermost row as well as the sidewalk which will remain or be improved upon in the same location. Along Lionsgate Drive there is a sidewalk that consist of a 5' wide concrete walk plus a 4' band of pavers with 4' x 4' tree grade that is tree lined and with street lights as well. There are two levels of parking. One is a ramp to go below the building and the other is a ramp to park above the parking below. The parking is screened with a low retaining wall of decorative brick all around the perimeter. They are preserving the mature trees and berm along College Road West. They are building a retaining wall behind there, so the grade comes up from the bicycle path to the top and maintains the grade as it exist today, which is a big improvement of what was done previously. The lobby entrances to all the buildings are on the three corners and there is a roof top terrace as well.

Mr. Bauer stated that the next slide was of Building B which has a bicycle path along the perimeter. On Lionsgate Drive there is a drop off with street trees and street lights. There is access to the two level parking garage. Across from the street corner is the Gateway Plaza to breakdown to human scale a very large vehicular intersection. There is a parking lot that they will be expanding to provide parking for residents and shoppers. They will also preserve the same landscaping on the berm. For Building C, which is a U shaped building, the access is off a service drive with an entrance to go below for parking underneath. There is a rooftop area with additional outdoor amenity uses. The plaza area is being renovated. The following slides were of views of Building A showing the screen wall and how they are minimizing the view of parking including nice landscaping. The images include an 80' wide asphalt bicycle path that will be improved and provide an amenity for all the residents. The following slide is of the streetscape at Lionsgate with the concrete sidewalk, paver tree grade, trees, lights and the sidewalk along Village Boulevard. The continuing slides are of the streetscape and signage wall. Slide L10 is of Building B showing the Gateway Plaza. L11 is of the entry structure from the intersection of Seminary Drive and College Road West with a screen wall that is open with decorative iron work, lights, signage and a canopy identifying the plaza, ample pavement for circulation, seating along the seat wall and well landscaped. This will complement the Princeton Nurseries Development and will be an attractive element in a pedestrian scale to a very large

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

vehicular intersection. Slide L15 is a photograph of the amenity space on the roof deck above the parking garage for both Building A & B. There is a pool and an outdoor space that can be used year round. It has a feature wall that will have barbeque grills on one side, and a television and fireplace on the other side. It will have comfortable seating and has direct access from the clubroom. The pool is on the west side that will be closed 9 months out of the year. Entering the area from College Road West is a low screen wall with gate access on two sides. The pool is elevated 12" to 14" above the pavement level, there are ample chaise lounges, landscape and fencing to buffer the residents on the ground floor and an attractive view from up above. Building C's roof deck amenity will have controlled access from the plaza, there are grills, bar and dining, a trellis with a television and outdoor furniture with ample landscaping to buffer the amenity terrace. The service drive will provide access to the parking below and will have a screen wall. The Public Plaza is being renovated. There will be a grand set of stairs to invite patrons from the plaza level to the retail area as well as a more simplified ramp access. There is also ramp access to get to the elevated restaurant area and another ramp access to get to the courtyard of Building C and the parking beyond. There will be new pavement, trees, furniture and lighting as well. It will be beautifully furnished with movable chairs and tables for the convenience of the residents and the patrons of the retail plaza. The plaza is mid-level between the restaurant level and the Rockingham Row retail level that is why there is a ramp up and ramp down.

Ralph Petrella, PE – Van Note Harvey gave an overview of his qualifications and without objection Chair Lehrhaupt accepted as an expert.

Mr. Petrella stated that Exhibit A3 is the overall site plan showing College Road West wrapping around Seminary Drive and Buildings A, B & C. The 2014 application created four lots. Lot 1.03 was for Building A, 1.06 was Building B and 1.07 was Building C with the 4th lot being what was remaining of the Princeton Forrestal Village. Under the proposed conditions, they will work with staff to get the actual designation for the new lots but the lot for Building A will be unchanged. For Building B they will take the original lot lines and increase it into lot 1.07 to give more room to provide for the ramp down to the parking area. The remaining of lot 1.07 will be consolidated back into the overall Princeton Forrestal Village site. Lastly they will create a new lot for Building C. The improvements are the three buildings, surface parking, shared pathway along the perimeter of College Road West and some improvements to the internal sidewalks within the site. They are providing 19 & 19 EV make-ready spaces for Buildings A and B and 10 for Building C. Exhibit A4 shows the EV spaces, the surface parking, the shared parking for Building C and the rest of the site as well as the parking designated for Building A and the drop off area for deliveries. Trash collection will be collected inside the building. A private hauler will be acquired and when it's time for pick up they take the containers out and return them inside. There is a drop off where they removed two parallel spaces at Building C. Exhibit A5 shows Building B's surface parking, shared parking, a pull off for deliveries similar to Building A and the door for trash to be brought out. Lionsgate Drive is where the trash will be collected. Overall between the residential and the Forrestal Village they are providing the required amount of parking. They are providing 741 residential parking spaces of which 112 are EV spaces and 64 will be constructed as each building is constructed. The remaining will be make ready.

Mr. Petrella stated that there is roughly an increase of 1.8 acres of impervious surface for stormwater management. The entire Forrestal Village drains to the DOT basin by Route 1.

Given that stormwater rules have changed they designed an underground system with the surface parking lot being porous pavement. They restricted their development, such that the flows under the proposed conditions are no different than today's flows. That does not account for the fact that the flows then also go to the DOT basin which was designed to provide water quantity.

Mr. Petrella noted that they received the technical review comments and will work with staff to address them satisfactorily. They will also assess College Road West and the internal drives where the improvements are going to be located and provide a plan that shows how those roads will be restored.

Carl Pehnke, PE – Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. gave an overview of his credentials and Chair Lehrhaupt accepted as an expert without objection.

Mr. Pehnke indicated that in 2014 a traffic analysis was done by Rogers & Associates that supported the development of the project and showed that the existing access and the circulation system could handle the residential units. The change in that application and the current application is that there is a reduction in traffic. The removal of commercial Building C (Can Do), which is 70,000 sq. ft of commercial space, is taking traffic out of the bucket. Access to Princeton Forrestal Village has been established since 1988. It has great access with internal circulation that will not change because of this application. From that standpoint traffic is well accommodated. The change to parking from 2014 is to eliminate the deck parking. This application is compliant with the ordinance on parking.

Mr. Yake stated that the Board has a review memo dated April 2, 2025. The applicant has requested 10 site plan checklist waivers and have submitted a list identifying and provided an explanation and justification for each. DRC and staff have reviewed them and are of the opinion that they are reasonable and support them being granted. The applicant is also requesting a five-year extended vesting pursuant to the applicable MLUL provisions and staff, and the DRC took no issue with this request. An effort has been made to preserve as many trees as possible and where trees can't be preserved the applicant will plant 4" to 5" in caliper deciduous trees in particular on College Road West. In 2014 the applicant was asked to comment on provisions for emergency services access and building identification for the three buildings and the final details were to be worked out with the Township Emergency Services personnel. DRC and staff recommended that the same process be addressed under the new application and the applicant has agreed. In 2014 the applicant was asked to discuss the adequacy of the proposed indoor and outdoor recreational facilities to serve the residents including the needs for children in the development, which they noted that the project was designed for young professionals and empty nesters. Since no playground is being proposed, DRC and staff are asking the applicant to monitor the demographics of the buildings to see if they need to provide additional recreational facilities. Prior to the release of the final CO for each of the three buildings, the applicant will provide the demographic information to staff for review. If the Township determines that additional recreational facilities are needed, the applicant will proceed to provide such facilities. The applicant will submit a plan for approval which will include the facility and be ADA compliant.

Chair Lehrhaupt asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board.

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 7

APRIL 21, 2025

Mayor Yates asked how will they regulate the EV parking spaces to ensure that non-electric vehicles will not park in those spaces and have they checked with PSEG to ensure they have enough capacity since current code requires 100% demand factor on EV chargers?

Mr. Johnson responded that each EV parking space are assigned, and they don't see a problem since it will be self-policed and the onsite leasing management in the buildings will quickly address any issue. The surface EV parking that is managed by a third party will have an operational plan for the campus wide management. As far as having enough electric loads, the applicant has spoken to the utility authorities, and they will size the electrical service for each of the buildings to accommodate EV charging. It will also be done sitewide since they are spread across the site and will be tied to different transformers.

Mayor Yates inquired about what the trigger was for the playground and where would it be located.

Mr. Yake replied that this condition is being carried over from the 2014 approval. The applicant will know how many children they are getting and if they need to make changes to the amenities after building one starts to filling up.

Mr. Johnson indicated that there is reference to indoor/outdoor recreation, but it doesn't specifically mention playground. In general elevator served buildings do not generate that many school-age children. There may be young families with pretoddlers, but these buildings are targeted for empty nesters and young professionals. The buildings will have an indoor playroom that is geared towards toddler ages one to five that include soft mats, games and tables with direct access to the outdoor courtyard. There will also be a club room and game room with arcade game, poker table, flat screen TV, networking space etc. that are geared more towards tweens and the residents will have access to the greater community recreation facilities. They believe they are providing adequate indoor recreation amenity spaced geared towards toddlers, tweens and adolescents.

Mayor Yates specified that it would be staff's determination later on in the project and Mr. Yake agreed.

Mayor Yates indicated that this is a greatly improved plan from the one in 2014 and thanked them for all the work they did to bring the affordable number up to 67. He asked if they secured a builder for the development.

Mr. DeGrazia stated that they are looking at partnerships but have not finalized anything yet.

Mr. Cantú asked if the existing parking off the plaza was factored in on the adequacy of the shared parking in the parking study?

Mr. Pehnke replied that the existing parking off the plaza will remain as parking for the Villages retail and commercial.

Mr. Greer questioned whether they are relying on the existing lighting or new lighting for the development?

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 8

APRIL 21, 2025

Mr. Bauer responded that there is new lighting. Along Lionsgate Drive there are new light standards that are 70' on center associated with street trees that are 35' on center. There was a comment from staff that the lighting intensity was too high. The calculation of 70' on center and 3,000k should not be that high but they will look into it and fully comply if they need to reduce the intensity to meet the staff recommendation.

Mr. Greer inquired if there will be a need for a new traffic light?

Mr. Pehnke answered that no because the access to Forrestal Village was designed for the levels of traffic. There is already a light at College Road West at the main entrance into the Forrestal Village and there is no need for additional traffic control.

Mr. Keevey asked what happened between 2014 and now and is it substantially different.

Mr. DeGrazia replied that the original approval had them creating three new buildings whereas, this design is removing an existing building that is 70,000 sq. ft. therefore reducing the intensity in terms of traffic and number of parking required.

Mr. Keevey questioned what happened in the last ten years.

Mr. DeGrazia responded that the original approval had a lot of structured parking elements that made it more difficult in terms of fiscal feasibility. This plan is vastly improved with its lower intensity and less need for parking as well as additional elements such as wider faced buildings, existing tree preservation, additional amenities, new architectural design and 17 additional affordable housing.

Mr. Keevey asked what was the total number of units and Mr. DeGrazia answered that the total is 394 units, which is the same as the previous approval as well as the same amount of density. The difference is the affordable units increased in terms of percentage.

Mr. Keevey asked if the current environment makes it more feasible and Mr. DeGrazia said yes.

Ms. Raturi inquired if the intention is to bring in more multifamily so that the retail shops will be more attractive?

Mr. DeGrazia responded that by having that amount of density it will help reactivate the area.

Ms. Raturi queried about what the school district would need to do?

Mr. Johnson replied that there may be school-aged children, but it will not affect the schools since they are gearing it towards young professionals.

Ms. Raturi question whether they have done a market study showing the need for multi-family units and Mr. Johnson replied that in general there is a housing demand not only in Plainsboro but county and state wide.

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 9

APRIL 21, 2025

Ms. Sharma noted that she has seen childcare being managed within a building.

Chair Lehrhaupt opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments.

Ms. Cecil swore in Denise Ward.

Ms. Ward stated that she is the President and Chairman of the Board for the Princeton Windrows. They have three main concerns. Their biggest concern is traffic. With the addition of possibly 400 cars or more and then with Nurseries adding 1000 cars that will be 1500 cars using College Road West. They are also concerned about traffic going west instead of going east. Instead of leaving the new development and going to Route 1 they go west to Princeton by using Seminary Drive to Academy Street then to Route 27. Windrow Drive off of College Road West goes around the development and off of it there is Evergreen Drive that goes to Seminary Drive. To make a left from Evergreen to Seminary currently is very difficult. It is very concerning with the addition of 1500 cars. Over the years they have asked for a traffic light be installed and understand that it is close to the other traffic light, but they want it to be considered now or in the future. If nothing else can be done they are asking for a "no thru traffic sign" be put on both Windrow Drives. At some point in the future once the no thru traffic signs are established a traffic study should be done for the possible light at Evergreen and Seminary.

Mr. Cantú stated that the no thru traffic should not be a major problem.

Mayor Yates remarked that he was not aware of any issues with the request but if Mr. Ploskonka could speak about it.

Mr. Ploskonka noted that the two projects are being mixed. The Nurseries project has a traffic agreement which includes several intersections that were studied. There are several analyses that have to be done, in particular at Evergreen and Seminary. One of those analyses is to see if a traffic signal is warranted. A Traffic signal has to be warranted and meet certain volume criteria. The Nurseries Development has an agreement that they are required to do those analyses.

Mr. Cantú asked if that study will include that particular intersection.

Mr. Ploskonka replied yes and that they have spoken to the applicant regarding installing no thru traffic signs already. He then requested that perhaps the current applicant could put the no thru traffic signs on Windrow Drive.

Mr. Pehnke replied that they would need authorization from the Home Owners Association.

Mr. Spiegel asked if part of the problem was because the Route 1 Bridge was not extended with a turning lane at Harrison Street which causes the traffic to back up.

Mr. Ploskonka stated those are regional issues that are going on for years.

Mayor Yates noted that the Penns Neck Project is being revitalized and may alleviate some problems.

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 10

APRIL 21, 2025

Mr. Cantú indicated that the modest improvements on Harrison Street have taken years for the State to respond to. There have been commitments to further improve that section, but

they are bound up in municipal objections to some of the improvements. They will continue to press it but do not want to give false hope since it's a difficult thing to sell to the state.

Mayor Yates stated that his understanding is that the applicant has agreed to install the no thru traffic signs but need authorization and asked Ms. Ward if she could work on that.

Ms. Ward indicated that they will put it up at a formal Board meeting which will be noticed and voted on.

Mayor Yates noted that when the Nurseries project comes before the Board they will have to do a traffic study. There are seven warrants, and they will need to meet at least one as well as get the state's approval to approve install the traffic light.

Mr. DeGrazia stated that since this is off site and private property they are willing to install the two signs at the time of construction provided that the owner of the property document the approval giving them the authorization to the satisfaction of the Township professional.

Ms. Ward indicated that she has come to the Township asking for assistance in getting the Street lights fixed on College Road West. PSEG has not cooperated. There are five PSEG poles on College Road West. Two on the corner of Windrow Drive, two on the corner of Main Street and one in further opposite Main Street. They have been out for months and what they have heard from PSEG is that there is an electrical problem that needs to be fixed before they could do anything.

Mayor Yates replied that he would talk to the Township Administrator to reach out to PSEG and find out what is the problem to get it resolved.

Mr. Cantú asked if there has been an outreach already by the administrator to PSEG.

Ms. Ward replied that yes and it helped with lights in the development, but they have not resolved the others.

Mayor Yates emphasized that he will follow up to make sure there is a response.

Ms. Ward noted that the street surface on College Road West is in bad condition.

Mr. Yake indicated that there is a condition in the review memo that talks about the need to address that issue. College Road West is part of the Forrester Village property therefore the responsibility of maintaining and restoring that roadway is the applicant's responsibility. There is a condition in the approval related to this.

Mr. Pehnke specified that he has testified that they will be looking at that and noting it in their plans.

Mr. Keevey asked if there was a way they could fix the roadway and Mr. Yake replied that yes the applicant could.

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 11

APRIL 21, 2025

Mr. DeGrazia responded that the difficulty is that they will mill and pave after construction and it doesn't make sense for them to do it now when construction vehicles will have access to it requiring them to mill and pave twice.

Mr. Keevey asked how long will it take to begin the project.

Mr. DeGrazia replied that they plan on moving as quickly as possible, but they need to line up the financing.

Mr. Keevey questioned if it would be one or two years and Mr. DeGrazia replied that a year or two is realistic.

Mr. Keevy stated that in the mean time they could fix the road.

Mr. DeGrazia answered that if there are any pot holes or dangerous conditions they will look into it, but they won't mill and pave until construction is done.

Louise Hartman was sworn by Ms. Cecil and inquired if dogs will be allowed in the new residences and Mr. Johnson replied that they are pet friendly buildings.

Ms. Hartman asked if there are any provisions for pet facilities and Mr. Johnson responded that there will be indoor dog washing stations in the building.

Ms. Hartman indicated that at the intersection of Main Street and College Road the lighting is very poor as well as a defunct crosswalk sign that is not because her dog got shocked and it needs to be looked into. Is there a plan to create a crosswalk to make it safer for pedestrians to cross College Road.

Mr. Johnson replied that there are existing crosswalks that will be mill and paved when the development goes in. There will be adequate safety to the satisfaction of the Township Engineers.

Ms. Hartman asked if there is a plan to reactivate the flashing pedestrian warning signs and Mr. Petrella indicated that they will be repair what is there.

Ms. Hartman questioned if there will be any signage which will help slow traffic by activating the crosswalk.

There being no further questions or comments from the public, it was MOVED by KEEVEY and seconded by GREER to close the public meeting and with a voice vote the public hearing was closed.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board, Chair Lehrhaupt asked Ms. Cecil to review the resolution.

Ms. Cecil stated that the proposed resolution is a series of findings based on the applicant's submissions, the Planning Board Review Memo and a detailed list of conditions which are based on the recommendations from the Planning Board Review Memo. Additions to the PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 12

APRIL 21, 2025

DRAFT resolution will be the additional information on the affordable housing units, references to the exhibits that were shown, the proposed renovation to the Public Plaza and the testimony on if the lighting levels need to be lowered they will do so. Another finding to be included under Circulation is on how deliveries will be handled. Additional conditions

to be added are the installation of the no thru traffic signs and the comments made by the public.

Mayor Yates requested that language be added to the resolution that staff will look at the old cross walk sign that is not working, whether or not that could be repaired and/or if there is a need to add a flashing pedestrian crossing.

Mr. DeGrazia commented that they would be happy to restripe it.

Mayor Yates insisted that staff look at if there is something existing that is broken the applicant shall repair if not look at the need to install a pedestrian beacon.

It was MOVED by KEEVEY and seconded by GREER to approve the resolution with the various amendments.

ROLL CALL:

Yates	-	yes	Keevey	-	yes	Raturi	-	n/a
Spiegel	-	yes	Agarwal	-	absent	Maheshwari	-	absent
Cantú	-	yes	Doshi	-	absent	Sharma	-	n/a
Lehrhaupt	-	yes	Greer	-	yes			

Chair Lehrhaupt introduced the Proposed Master Plan Amendments to the Utility Service Plan Element and the Stormwater Management Update.

Ms. Flynn stated that this public hearing is to update both the Stormwater Management Plan that is required by DEP as well as the Master Plan Utility Service Plan because it references the Stormwater Management Plan. The last phrase on the second page of the draft resolution should read "Township's Utility Service Element" not Stormwater Management Plan. The Utility Service Plan is generally the same but small updates were made and Azeem will speak to the changes that DEP had in their regulations. Last year we updated our Stormwater Ordinance and this plan compliments that.

Mr. Youssef indicated that the Municipal Stormwater Management Plan originally took effect and was adopted by this Board in 2005, because of the changes at the Federal level from the EPA in 1999 to try and eliminate discharge of pollutants into the US Water Ways, such as the Delaware River. There have been subsequent updates that took place in 2007 and now in 2025. Each update has had various changes associated with the updates to the Stormwater Management Regulation in New Jersey. The most recent updates were due to a recent rule change in regulating motor vehicle surface, green infrastructure requirements and different low-impact development techniques.

There being no members of the public present, it was MOVED by YATES and SECONDED by PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 13

APRIL 21, 2025

KEEVEY to close the public meeting.

Ms. Cecil specified that the resolution has two components. One being, the adoption of the revised Stormwater Management Plan because Municipal Land Use Law requires Municipalities to have an adopted Stormwater Management Plan, which was done in 2005

then revised but most recently, in response to regulatory changes at the State level it had to be updated. The other is since the Stormwater Management Plan is part of the Master Plan Utility Plan Element, the Utility Plan Element must be updated to incorporate the adopted revised Stormwater Management Plan.

It was MOVED by KEEVEY and seconded by GREER to approve the resolution.

ROLL CALL:

Yates	-	yes	Keevey	-	yes	Raturi	-	yes
Spiegel	-	yes	Agarwal	-	absent	Maheshwari	-	absent
Cantú	-	yes	Doshi	-	absent	Sharma	-	n/a
Lehrhaupt	-	yes	Greer	-	yes			

It was MOVED by KEEVEY and seconded by YATES to approve the January 21, 2025 Planning Board Minutes as submitted.

ROLL CALL:

Yates	-	yes	Keevey	-	yes	Raturi	-	n/a
Spiegel	-	yes	Agarwal	-	absent	Maheshwari	-	absent
Cantú	-	yes	Doshi	-	absent	Sharma	-	n/a
Lehrhaupt	-	yes	Greer	-	yes			

Ms. Flynn reminded the Board to please do their Financial Disclosure Statement and that the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan will be coming before the Board in June. The Circulation Element which is being worked on will be presented to the subcommittee.

There being no further business, it was MOVED by KEEVEY and SECONDED by GREER to adjourn the meeting at 8:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Josi Easter, Board Secretary

Board Approval Date: _____