

**PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD**  
**JUNE 16, 2025 MEETING**  
**MINUTES**

**MEETING HELD:**

Monday, June 16, 2025 at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Building Court room

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBER ATTENDANCE:**

Ed Yates, **Peter Cantú**, Arthur Lehrhaupt, Richard Keevey, Jetal Doshi, Joseph Greer and Reeta Sharma were present.

Cary Spiegel, Sanjeev Agarwal, Sanjana Raturi 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 21 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	-	absent
Spiegel	-	absent	Agarwal	-	absent	Maheshwari	-	absent
<b>Cantú</b>	-	yes	Doshi	-	yes	Sharma	-	yes
Lehrhaupt	-	yes	Greer	-	yes			

It was MOVED by KEEVEY and seconded by GREER to approve the April 21, 2025 Planning Board meeting Minutes as submitted and with a voice vote they were approved.

**PROPOSED MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE HOUSING ELEMENT AND FAIR SHARE PLAN**

Jennifer Beahm, Director of Planning, Leon S. Avakian, Inc. Affordable Housing Consultant for Plainsboro Township was sworn in by Ms. Cecil stated that legislation was adopted last year which changed the framework from which Affordable Housing was evaluated and put forth to the court system. The legislation created the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program (The Program) which consists of 12 retired judges throughout the state that evaluated the obligations for all the municipalities that chose to participate in this process. In October of 2024 the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (DCA) issued a memo which identified the

affordable housing obligation for each Town including their rehabilitation(rehab) obligation called present need and new construction obligation called perspective need. The evaluation has three factors that determine the affordable housing obligation. 1<sup>st</sup> is income, 2<sup>nd</sup> is nonresidential valuation, and 3<sup>rd</sup> is the land capacity factor. The factors were weighted evenly and averaged to create an average allocation factor which was multiplied against the number of affordable housing units that DCA determined would be required. They projected that 11,604 affordable units are needed in Region 3(Middlesex, Somerset and Hunterdon Counties). In November, DCA released their land capacity data, and the Township evaluated it to determine its accuracy. The process required each Municipality to either accept the DCA number or reject it and provide the rationale why by the end of January 2025. The DCA data stated that Plainsboro has 379 acres of developable land but when we evaluated the data we reduced it to 142 acres, which changed the land capacity factor from 3.67% to 1.36% and reduced the obligation from 309 affordable units to 219. We prepared a memo, which was attached to a resolution that the Governing Body adopted, and submitted it to the program in January. In February the Fair Share Housing Center and the Builders determined whether or not they were going to accept what the municipalities had stated in their resolutions or if they were going to appeal it. In March dispute resolution took place, where municipalities were assigned a program judge and adjudicator. Fair Share Housing Center and the Builders objected to Plainsboro's adjusted numbers. However, the Builders did not proceed with mediation since Fair Share had objected. Therefore, Plainsboro mediated with Fair Share Housing Center, the judge and the adjudicator and settled on an obligation of 240 units. Since then they have been working on coming up with a Fair Share Plan to address the 240 unit obligation. Historically a family rental unit was eligible for a 2 for 1 credit but because the bonus structure changed, it is no longer available. There are some bonuses for supportive needs housing, redevelopment and **senior housing that are a ½ a credit per unit or 2 for 1 credit.**

Ms. Beahm indicated that the front portion of the document before the Board is the Housing Element which is required under the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) as part of the Master Plan. They have updated all the demographic information including employment, housing population, housing stock etc. which was taken primarily from the census or other known data sources. The plan gives a summary of the affordable housing obligation, and the present need is the rehab obligation of 53 units. To satisfy the rehab obligation, the Township has engaged with Community Grants Planning and Housing (CGP&H) for them to implement and manage a new rehab program. They anticipate that the cost per rehab unit is \$25,000.00. How it works is, if an income eligible individual wants to do something to their unit (bring it up to code, fix the roof, fix the windows etc.), they receive \$25,000.00 from the Trust Fund. If they stay in their home for 10 years or more they do not have to repay the funds. However, if they leave prior to the 10 years they are obligated to pay back the Trust Fund. They are anticipating 5 rehab units per year for the period of 2025 to 2035. If it's less than 53, compliance is still maintained by participating in the program and allocating the funds.

Ms. Beahm stated that the fourth round obligation is for 240 units that are being realized with the surplus in a number of projects, such as: extending controls in 11 Tamarron Units, 96 units in the Princeton Nurseries project, 66 units in the Fusion project, of which 26 are family rental and 40 are supportive need that are eligible for 40 bonus credits for a total of 106; Princeton Forrestal Village has 67 units **that are eligible for 6 ½ bonus credits for a total of 73 ½ and the PMUD rezoning will result in 107 units with 13 ½ bonus credits for a total of 120.** That proposal is for 407 credits.

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 3

June 16, 2025

Ms. Beahm emphasized that the legislation has a very strict and short timeline to get this done. The plan needs to be approved and submitted to the court by June 30<sup>th</sup> to maintain its immunity after which interested parties have time to provide comments. That will take place during July and August and in the fall changes will be made if any and implementing zoning will be done after that.

Bonnie Flynn specified that rezoning is anticipated for two lots in the PMUD Zone. The PMUD Zone allows for residential, but the proposed rezoning is for inclusionary residential. There are 2 office buildings in one of the lots that we are hoping can be renovated. We may make changes to the ordinance down the road depending on the reaction to this plan.

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

Mayor Yates asked if August 28<sup>th</sup> was the deadline for comments to the plan which Ms. Beahm confirmed.

Rich Keevey asked who did we negotiate with, and Ms. Beahm replied that the negotiations were with Judge Jacobson from Mercer County and Fair Share.

Joe Greer asked for a confirmation of the number of units, to which Ms. Beahm replied that the physical units including the projected PMUD rezoning is 347 with an additional 60 bonus points for a total of 407 units.

There being no further comments or questions from the Board or the public, it was MOVED by KEEVEY and SECONDED by GREER to close the public hearing.

**ROLL CALL:**

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

Trishka W. Cecil, Mason, Griffin & Pierson, P.C., Planning Board Attorney stated that the resolution includes the amendments to the Fair Housing Act, the background of filing the litigation, going through the program and the adoption of the plan.

It was MOVED by KEEVEY and SECONDED By CANTÚ to approve the resolution.

**ROLL CALL:**

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

**P24-03 WRV NURSERIES OWNER LLC. PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN AND SUBDIVISION, BLOCK 102 & 106, LOTS 5, 6 & 1**

Ms. Cecil indicated that the notice was in order, and the Board can take jurisdiction.

Kate Coffey, Esq., from Day Pitney, LLP. attorney for the applicant gave an overview of the project. The property is approximately 108.8 acres and is currently vacant. It is located in the PMUD Zone and is subject to a General Development Plan(GDP). The GDP envisioned a highly amenitized neighborhood that will be anchored by a commercial main street, that includes modern office spaces, diverse range of shopping, dining, entertainment and open spaces as well as a variety of housing choices including affordable and age-restricted housing. It provides for a 20-year period phasing schedule because of the size of the property. However, the applicant is intending to have a much shorter timeframe in 3 phases of which the first 2 phases, that is the majority of the improvements, be constructed in about 6 to 8 years. Phase 3 will be subject to a future site plan application but will be discussed for the purpose of understanding the use for the buildings as well as the density that is envisioned. All the infrastructure, roads etc. will be done upfront including phase 3. The plan incorporates the 7 core principles in the GDP by creating a main street with pedestrian and vehicle opportunities to anchor and navigate the community; having a civic space to serve the community as well as Plainsboro at large that provides opportunities for informal gatherings and programmed events; it is using streets to create a sense of community and to define spaces with different uses within the community; it includes the residential neighborhood orientation principle by making sure that the proposed new homes can take advantage of the amenities and give them a designated location; it strategically uses open space, parking zones, to make sure each use has enough parking and finally provides a crossing from the community over Heathcote Brook a/k/a Harry's Brook.

Ms. Coffey noted that the application is for a preliminary and final subdivision to create 30 lots and 2.2 acres dedicated to the Right-of-Way (ROW) at Nursery Road totaling 108.8 acres and for preliminary and final site plan which proposes retail, office, hotel, restaurants and grocer spaces as well as a range of different residential opportunities including single-family homes, townhouses, stacked townhouses, carriage homes, age-restricted flats, multifamily apartments and affordable housing integrated throughout the townhouses as well as in the multifamily buildings. The primary crossing into the community goes from Harry's Brook using the roundabout but a 2<sup>nd</sup> crossing is contemplated for bicycle and pedestrian use. A main street running down the center flanked by mixed-use buildings, hotel, civic space and retail is planned. Phase 1 will include 2 mixed-use buildings A & B. Building A includes 136 multifamily rental units, of which 62 are 1 bedroom, 67 are 2 and 7 are 3 bedroom units. 16 out of the 136 units are affordable units of which 4 are 1 bedroom, 11 are 2 and 1 has 3 bedrooms. It also includes 24,675 sq. ft of retail and commercial space. Mixed-use building B has 30,000 sq. ft of retail and commercial space and 198 multifamily rental units of which 87 are 1 bedroom, 97 are 2 and 14 are 3 bedrooms. Out of the 198 units 28 are affordable with a breakdown of 4 are 1 bedroom, 16 are 2 and 8 are 3 bedrooms. On the central spine a recreation building/clubhouse is being proposed that is open to the public. Building D1 has 29,150 sq. ft of retail and 80,080 sq. ft of office. On the western side of the property they are proposing 20 single-family homes limited to 3 bedrooms, that they have agreed to deed restrict as per staff request, and 231 townhomes of which 32 are set aside for low and moderate-income households. The eastern side will have 51 townhomes, 114 stacked townhomes, 20 of which are affordable, 72 age

restricted flats, 31 age-restricted carriage homes and an additional clubhouse and pool that serves that side of the community. Phase 2 has building C that will be a 75,000 sq. ft. hotel with 125 rooms, building D2 that is approximately 10,000 sq. ft of retail and building D3 that is intended to be a grocer with 30,000 sq. ft. They envision the future phase 3 to have 97 age-restricted rental units as well as 40,000 sq. ft. of retail in 2 buildings.

Ms. Coffey indicated that the GDP contemplated a maximum of 950 residential units with a maximum of 200 age-restricted units. The applicant is proposing a total of 750 non-age-restricted units, 654 of which will be market rate and 96 affordable, as well as 200 age-restricted market rate units, which includes 97 being planned in 3<sup>rd</sup> phase. The central spine road is meant to serve as the main boulevard entrance into the community which will be dedicated to the Township, but the applicant will be responsible for the maintenance of the road subject to an agreement with the municipality. All other roads will remain private. The GDP requires that 30% of the property be preserved for open space and the applicant is proposing 42%, which is more than 46 acres of land, 2 acres of which is the central civic space that includes a green lawn, a pond, seating areas an amphitheater as well as 2 acres of neighborhood parks and a conservation area that will be deed restricted. They are requesting minor relief specifically from section 85-22E1 which requires that sidewalks be provided on both sides of the road. The vast majority of the plan provides sidewalks on both sides, except for certain locations along portions of Roads B, C & E that adjoin to areas that will not be developed and portions of Roads G & K that have grade concerns that can't accommodate sidewalks. However, the applicant is proposing, in all cases that landscaping be provided in accordance with the recommendations of staff as well as crosswalks including midblock, to ensure that there is an uninterrupted pedestrian path to navigate the entirety of the community. They are also requesting relief from several of the residential site improvements standards. The 1<sup>st</sup> is from section 5:21-4.2 which requires sidewalks on both sides which they addressed. 2<sup>nd</sup> is from section 5:21-4.19b2 which requires a minimum distance between intersection locations which they believe is appropriate because the roadways are low volume. 3<sup>rd</sup> is from section 5:21-4.19b3 that specifies a minimum intersection curb radius, and they are providing turning maneuvering plans that demonstrate that the project continues to work safely and efficiently despite the relief request. The standard is 25' and the applicant is proposing 28 for the curb radii. Lastly they are requesting relief from section 5:21-4.19b5 which requires a minimum center line radius for a residential neighborhood street of 100 and the applicant is proposing 31' and 46'. They believe the relief can be granted because the alleys are intended to serve as drive aisles not for thru traffic.

Ms. Cecil swore in the Board professionals Lou Ploskonka and Ron Yake as well as the applicant's witnesses as follows:

- Arthur Kuyan, P.P. – Planner, Russo Development
- Stuart Johnson, AIA – Architect, Minno Wasko Architects and Planners
- Thomas Bauer - Landscape Architect, Melillo Bauer Carman Landscape Architecture
- Karl Pehnke, PE - Traffic Engineer, Langan Engineering & Environmental Services, Inc.
- Chad Gaulrapp – Civil Engineer, Van Note–Harvey Division of Pennoni

Arthur Kuyan gave an overview of his credentials and Chair Lehrhaupt accepted him as an expert without exception.

Mr. Kuyan indicated that exhibit A1 is a time line of the history for the GDP plan approval.

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

Mr. Johnson specified that Exhibit A2 is a colored rendering of the Site Plan. He provided a description of the proposed application including uses, density, site layout etc. The site's primary entrance is at the intersection of Seminary Drive and College Road West, which creates a gateway with low landscaped walls that provide opportunity for monument signage and identification as well as pedestrian access to the surrounding uses such as Princeton Forrestal. The primary road runs in a north - south direction and has open space and two large mix-use buildings (A&B) at the center of the site with a primary residential lobby with a hardscape treatment and a drop off area. They also have a dedicated loading space on either the northern side of the building or on the western east side of the building for things like trash pick-up etc.. The mixed-use buildings include retail; structured parking; 334 rental apartment units; open area landscaped courtyard with a pool and fast casual dining. Building C will be a hotel on the western side when entering the site. Building is D1 on the eastern side and provides for 2 levels of office. Building D2 is a 1-story commercial building with a drive thru. Proposed Building D3 is a 1-story commercial grocer pad. Lastly building D4 is a 2-story clubhouse with amenities. The western residential portion of the site will be comprised of 251 new residences including townhomes and 2-story residential homes that are diverse in size and scale and uniquely laid out fronting tree lined streets with walkable sidewalks. The eastern portion of the site has 268 new residences including stacked townhomes with 20 affordable units that don't have dedicated parking but have assigned street surface parking, traditional townhomes, carriage style age-restricted homes, age-restricted flats/condo units with structured parking in the basement and a 1-story clubhouse building. Lots E1 & E2 are not associated with this application but are for a future phase of the project, will include commercial/retail and additional age-restricted housing units.

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 introduced exhibit A3, which is an video presentation of the site.

Mr. Bauer indicated that exhibit A4 is 29 pages of still images showing: retail signage; entrance into the community; Building D1 and the retail spaces with office above and landscaping; surface parking; view north of Building A & B; views of Road D and A; a slide of the 5 story hotel looking west; a low aerial view looking east of Road 2; close up view of the water feature in the civic space; city steps; amphitheater; main street; exterior architecture showing a variety of materials; handicap accessibility throughout the site; lighting; shade trees; entrances to mix-use buildings which will have onsite management; area between building A & B will be textured with a rumbled effect to slow traffic and the use of bollards to control vehicle circulation; clock tower; single-family homes; townhomes; tree lined streets; parallel parking; secondary entrance to the community; parks; children play areas; Clubhouse; swimming pool; pickle ball court; BBQ area; fire place; TV; stacked townhomes; carriage homes and alley ways.

Chad Gaulrapp, Van Note - Harvey Division of Pennoni Civil Engineers gave an overview of his credentials and without objection Chair Lehrhaupt accepted as an expert.

Mr. Gaulrapp stated that the project will be served by public water and sewer. Water will have

2 main connections at the proposed intersections and Sewer will have a pump station at the north/west portion of the project. The flow will be pumped from that location south to South Brunswick's boundary and easterly to a manhole proposed in the approximate area of the roundabout. The rest of the community will flow by gravity to an existing sewer manhole located at the upper eastern corner of the property. They need the Township to be co-applicants along with South Brunswick who will be receiving the flow as well as the Stonybrook Regional Authority. Once everyone consents they will apply to the State.

Mr. Gaulrapp introduced sheet # 10 which is a condominium style subdivision plan indicating that the majority of the townhomes are all on combined lots and the roadways are proposed as roadway easements, therefore, don't require rights-of-way (ROW). However, east of main street will require ROW's. The plan shows that the NVR area is 1 lot; the single-family homes are 20 lots; the hotel is 1 lot; proposed building A is 1 lot; proposed E1 is 1 lot; proposed E2 is 1 lot; D1, D2 & D3 are 1 lot and the entirety of the Pulte residential will be 30 lots.

Ms. Coffey asked Mr. Gaulrapp if all the proposed lots front on private street or on the main artery that is a public road which he confirmed.

Ms. Coffey asked Mr. Gaulrapp if the acreage for each of the proposed 20 single-family lots are 0.17 acres to which he replied yes.

Mr. Gaulrapp stated that there is a conservation area that is designated as a lot and that the site will be served by a very large network of sidewalks and share-the-road bikeways. There are 60+ facilities proposed to address best stormwater management practices established in the state codes which are a combination of surface basins and subsurface basins.

Mr. Gaulrapp noted that plan sheet CS0202 has tables listing the RSIS Criteria and whether or not they are in conformance and if not, they provide a basis as to why it is acceptable. To address the RSIS standard regarding the separation between intersections that is established at 150', they are proposing a center median at Road E of 96'.

Mr. Gaulrapp indicated that they are providing adequate loading for the non-residential facilities. For quicker drop offs there are pull offs and for larger deliveries the back parking lots will have designated loading areas.

Karl 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 stated that they prepared a traffic impact study last revised on May 23, 2025. Since the 1980's the Princeton Nurseries site contemplated commercial space and residential units and was part of a developer's agreement with the Department of Transportation resulting in the construction of roadway infrastructure namely the College Road overpass with Route 1 and College Road and Seminary Drive. All of which has been built over the years to support the development of the surrounding area as well as the Nurseries site. As recently as 2018 and 2020 they revisited traffic and embodied some detailed traffic studies in the GDP approval, which looked at higher levels of density on the site from a commercial standpoint and reidentified certain improvements associated with this project that would need to be implemented to enhance the prior constructed improvements. This project is

about 30% less traffic intensity than what was contemplated in the GDP. However, it does trigger certain improvements that were identified in the GDP. Therefore, they will be constructing those improvements as a singular project upfront as the onsite roadway is built. The improvements are: widening of College Road in the west bound direction to carry the 2<sup>nd</sup> thru lane across the entire project from Village Road to Road E; widening Seminary Drive to provide a left turn into Road E and a reciprocal left turn lane into Evergreen Drive; the intersection of College Road, Seminary Drive and Road A will be reconfigured on the north bound approach to have 2 left turn lanes, a thru lane and a right turn lane to College Road; south bound will also have a double left turn lane, a thru lane and a right turn lane and the signal will be reconstructed and upgraded to include all the infrastructure for pedestrian accommodations to current standards. A requirement of the GDP is that at the time of any site plan application the intersection of Evergreen Drive and Road E be rechecked to see if a signal is warranted. In order to install a traffic signal an engineer has to certify that it meets certain warrants that are published by the manual of uniform traffic control devices. It is done on the basis of a warrant analysis which was done for this application and based on the current traffic study that intersection does not meet the requirements. However, they will revisit it again when they submit the future site plan application for buildings E1 and E2 and with any other site plan application. When building the geometry in widening College Road, they will be doing all the underground for the signal. Therefore, if they meet the warrant, the signal can be installed without disturbing the pavement, streetscape etc. The GDP has a trigger for improvements at College Road East and Scudders Mill Road which will be done by extending the median double left turn lane at College Road East approaching Scudders Mill Road and on the west bound approach to Scudders Mill. The analysis finds that access operates at great level of service and will accommodate the day to day operations of this facility. Granting the variances for the de minimis exceptions to the RSIS standards inside the site, are both appropriate and do not result in any deficiencies in terms of traffic flow or safety. The types of variances that are being requested are typical to the mixed-use environment. They analyzed Main Street and have determined that the roadway configuration that has been established on this plan will accommodate the development of this site as well as any future development in South Brunswick and they are confident that they are providing for a proper design on Main Street which will successfully support the residences and commercial businesses on the site.

Ms. Coffey asked Mr. Pehnke that although currently a signal is not warranted at Evergreen Drive the applicant is providing a no thru-traffic sign which Mr. Pehnke replied yes subject to the approval of the owners of that property.

Ms. Coffey asked Mr. Pehnke if the earmarked parking for each of the buildings exceeds the GDP requirements to which he replied yes.

Mr. Kuyan stated that as whole the project provides ample pedestrian circulation throughout the site and the few locations where they are not providing sidewalks on both sides of the street will not impact the overall circulation to the site.

Mr. Kuyan noted that RSIS requires a new intersection be offset by at least 150' between the center line and the project is 96.65' at the south western portion near Seminary Drive and to mitigate that they are providing a center median in order to prevent some of the movements that this requirement tends to prevent.



PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 9

June 16, 2025

Mr. Kuyan specified that the project focuses on the 7 core principals of the GDP, and the project promotes multiple purposes of the MLUL.

Mayor Yates requested a 10 minute recess at 9:03pm.

Chair Lehrhaupt resumed the meeting at 9:12pm

Mr. Yake stated that the comprehensive Planning Board Review Memo dated June 4, 2025 includes the issues of compliance with the GDP, the Zoning Regulations, the subdivision and site plan review regulations, design guidelines in the GDP as well as DRC and Staff recommendations. The applicant is requesting 18 subdivision and 7 site plan review check list waivers. They have provided an explanation and justification for each, and DRC and Staff are of the opinion that such waivers are reasonable and support that they be granted. There are 6 waivers related to sidewalks on both sides of the street. 3 are along Roads B, C and E, where sidewalks on both sides is unnecessary, in particular along the properties that are not being developed which DRC and Staff support. 2 are along buildings G and K, which involve significant grade changes and accommodations for sidewalks is not practical. DRC and Staff have recommended granting these waivers subject to the screening and landscaping recommended in the review memo which the applicant has agreed to and will be a condition of approval. The 6<sup>th</sup> waiver is along the E2 building which is related to phase 3 of the project and is not part of this application. Staff recommends that this waiver be deferred until the application for that site is submitted.

Mr. Yake indicated that the applicant is requesting that Road A be a public street, subject to a comprehensive perpetual maintenance agreement with the Township, because New Jersey American Water requires a 15' wide exclusive easement for their water mains on private streets and given the urban design goal of limiting the width of the main street to one travel lane each way with on street parking on either side, there wouldn't be enough room for the other necessary utilities for the project, if this were private. By entering into this maintenance agreement, the applicant would be wholly responsible for the maintenance of all the improvements within the Nursery Road right-of-way including the roundabout. Staff recommends that this be addressed within the context of a Developer's Agreement that would follow the approval of this project. Staff recommends that the applicant place the proposed roundabout, which is at the northern boundary with South Brunswick, entirely in Plainsboro. Pursuant to the GDP and the PMUD Zone regulations, only when a traffic analysis has been submitted to the Township and reviewed and recommended by the Township's engineer's office, the connection to South Brunswick can be allowed. To make that connection an amendment to the site plan will be required. In the meantime the roundabout will remain entirely within the Plainsboro Nursery site. The proposed street network within the site has been designed with pedestrians and bicycle safety in mind with posted speeds of 15 to 25mph. If the minimum enforceable travel speed of 25mph is to be effectively enforced, DRC and Staff recommends that the applicant enter into a Title 39 agreement with the Township and include in the Developer's Agreement, allowing Township Police to enforce motor vehicle laws within the development. The GDP and PMUD Zone regulations call for a connection with South Brunswick, but due to the commercial and industrial land uses planned for the adjoining area, such connection will be limited to pedestrian and bicycle path or trail only. However, since South Brunswick is not currently proposing a pedestrian or bicycle pathway on their site, staff recommends that a pedestrian access easement be provided on the Plainsboro site to

accommodate for future pathway connection. If such pathway is constructed, then the applicant will be required to construct a pathway connection to the South Brunswick site. Staff recommends that this be included in the Developer's agreement. The applicant identifies numerous streets or roadways as A thru P and alleys 1 to 14 and because the Township Code requires that the names of streets not be duplicative in appearance or in sound, staff will work with the applicant, local emergency services and the Princeton Post Office at Carnegie Center that services this portion of the Township, to consider names or identifiers for the proposed streets and alleys.

Mr. Yake specified that DRC and staff recommend that the applicant enter into a Developer's Agreement with the Township to include but not limited to the following: the ownership and maintenance of open space areas; pedestrian and bicycle circulation network as well as roadways, alleys and other common elements of the project; access easements and the construction of the possible future pedestrian and bikeway connection to South Brunswick; the location of the roundabout and the possible extension into South Brunswick pursuant to the requirements in the GDP and PMUD Zone regulations; the perpetual maintenance agreement involving Nursery Road; affordable housing requirement, Title 39 enforcement agreement; the provision of providing a shuttle service per the requirement set forth in the adopted GDP agreement; as well as any other requirement set forth in the GDP Developer's Agreement between the Township and the Trustees of Princeton University.

Mr. Yake stated that lastly DRC and staff recommend that a comprehensive signage plan, primarily for the nonresidential uses and wayfinding, be prepared and reviewed by staff based on the guidance provided by the GDP Design guidelines and subject to the approval of the Planning Board. Staff recommends that the applicant tenant signage program be prepared by a sign design consultant with experience in preparing comprehensive sign programs for similar mixed-use developments which the applicant has agreed to.

Mr. Yake noted that Staff believes that this project, subject to compliance with the recommendations made by DRC and staff, substantially complies with the requirements and goals of the GDP for the Nursery site as well as applicable zoning and site plan regulations.

Mr. Ploskonka stated that the Traffic analyses were performed in accordance with the GDP requirements as well as the mitigation plan that has been developed. Regarding parking, they concur that there is a surplus in the project, when looking at the mixed-use core and the two residential areas separately each component has additional parking in each of those areas. Stormwater has been designed to meet the Municipal Code requirements for water quantity reductions, water quality and ground water recharge requirements. To accomplish that, the applicant is proposing 40 subsurface basins, 17 bioretention basins, 2 infiltrations basins, several core asphalt areas and 19 green infrastructure manufactured treatment devices. The plan has a robust landscaping plan as well as a proposal for 2.43 acres of reforestation that will be provided per Township Code. There is a need for site remediation for the project that will be performed under the oversight of a licensed site remediation professional with the required reporting to the NJDEP. Finally, the applicant has agreed to all the comments in the Technical Appendix of the staff memo and will work with staff to complete.

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

Mayor Yates asked if they are proposing a no left turn exiting Road E?

Mr. Gaulrapp replied that the proposed restricted no left turn would be on the ingress. Therefore, the no left turn would be into Road B from Road E, but the exit would permit turns in either direction.

Mayor Yates asked if staff is comfortable with the approval of this project when several engineering and technical aspects need to be worked out including outside agency approvals?

Mr. Ploskonka replied that they have identified all the items that needed to be done prior to the Boards approval and the remainder of the items in the technical appendix will not preclude the application from going forward as they feel the applicant can address them.

Mr. Greer asked if there will be adequate and ample parking on the street?

Mr. Ploskonka replied that the residential portion has to meet the RSIS standard that are based on each unit's bedroom count and includes visitor parking which they meet in all cases and then some.

**Mr. Cantú** asked what will be permitted on the E1 and E2 sites.

Mr. Yake replied that those sites are not subject to this application. E1 will have 96 age-restricted rental units and retail, or it could be just retail and E2 is designated for commercial only. Both will require site plan approval from the Board.

Mr. Keevey asked when do they expect to start and end this project.

Ms. Coffey replied that they expect to start in the next 6 months if approved and the first 2 phases to be completed in the next 6 to 8 years.

There being no further question or comments from the Board, Chair Lehrhaupt opened the meeting for question or comments from the public.

Ms. Cecil swore in Mark Smith who stated that he objects to the project. He submitted the Princeton Nurseries/Kingston Site Cultural Landscape Report done by South Brunswick and marked as Exhibit P1. He believes that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is wrong because it seems as if the applicant used Geo Mapping to identify the flora and fauna and have not offered a full species survey of what exists on the property. There was a tree survey which was a random sampling in a couple of areas that is not sufficient for such a large site. The report states that there aren't any trees that are 30" in diameter but he has personally measured a Maple tree that is 53" in diameter which could be 100s of years old. He feels that there should be another review since he has identified 10 trees with 40" of diameter without going around the whole property. There has been much continued growth of that former Nursery stock which created its own eco system. The EIA is silent on the implications of removing these plants and trees. For example there are Rhododendron that were planted on the site over 100 years ago that are still thriving amongst many others. There are thousands of feet of trees in the Windrows that exist on the property, and the applicant says they are going to save a stretch of these trees but that leaves thousands of feet gone. No description is in the

EIA to show what areas are forested or what the relationship is to each other and of the natural features. No actual representation is made as to what wooded sections are to be preserved. He feels the Board does not have enough to evaluate this ecological harm. The ordinance requires that the applicant identify alternatives to the proposed project. In section 3F labeled alternatives of the EIA ordinance the applicant restates the nature of project. Therefore, it fails to meet the EIA code because no alternatives are proposed. No discussion of what creatures or species live in the wildlife habitat is in the EIA. The applicant hasn't undertaken a survey to identify any animal species that lives on the site. Here too, the Board does not have an adequate amount of information in which to evaluate the environmental impact for this project. This is in violation of ordinance that requires the EIA to provide inventory of wild life habitat. He and his wife have observed many species on the site and have sent these findings to the DEP that have acknowledged the submission and sent ID#'s confirming the opening of the files. The DEP has said that there is a backlog going back to 2012. Exhibit P2 was submitted outlining the DEP's response that they have received information from residents and have noted it and will take a look at it in the future. With regard to traffic no actual data has been provided supporting the position that air quality will not be effected. The traffic report fails to include the estimated truck traffic impact with its noise and fumes that is not presently part of the site. In addition, the existing intersection in Kingston leading to the site is already failing in key points and the addition of several thousand potential vehicles each day will only exacerbate this problem. The study hasn't given proper analysis to the project on intersections in the greater area. As an example Academy and Route 27 during peak hours has an F according to traffic calculations. With the project the traffic categories are only going to get worse. That is a problem for the surrounding communities. No evaluation has been done on the increase of runoff on the wetlands or how they are going to be mitigated. No sewage information has been provided in the EIA as to what will happen if a pump fails. They take objection to the waivers and variances being requested because no adequate records exist that go to the material part of the Plainsboro Code in particular with regard to traffic, safety, setbacks etc. There are no basis for a waiver or variance from the EIA requirements. He would like the Board to reconsider the application until more evidence comes forth to allow for more evaluation from outside experts.

Ms. Coffey noted that exhibit P1 was a report done in 2011. In terms of the environmental impacts the project is unique because it all stems from the GDP which Plainsboro put together to determine the future of the 108 acres that is within its boundaries. The GDP details many of the considerations that Mr. Smith has identified including its own survey of environmental inventory as well as very specific provisions related to traffic. The Township and the Board in crafting the GDP considered many of these impacts when determining what uses, what density, what layout and what traffic movements it would like to see on the site which informed the applicant's proposal to the Board.

Ms. Coffey specified that with regard to the EIA, she would like to correct the record in a couple of key respects. One is where Mr. Smith stated that there have been no discussion about the impacts to wetlands when in fact section 3A1 of the EIA deals with wetlands and it states that there are no impact to wetlands in the transition areas proposed and it also includes a letter of interpretation that was received from the NJDEP which has jurisdiction over the wetlands that are involved in the site. Similarly section 3A4 entitled "Woodland and Wildlife Habitat" which summarizes the findings related to the animal habitat that has been mapped out by NJDEP on the site and includes discussion of those species. In terms of tree removal, the applicant

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 13

June 16, 2025

provided a tree removal plan in accordance with the GDP requirements as well as during testimony the conservation area where many trees are to be preserved was shown on the right side of the plan and Mr. Ploskonka stated that there is an area that will be reforested in accordance with Plainsboro's Tree Removal Ordinance requirements that is on the far left side of the plan labeled "Reforestation Area".

Ms. Coffey indicated that there was a separate Traffic Study submitted that Mr. Pehnke provided a summary of during his testimony. The application must be looked at as hand in hand with the GDP since the applicant took its directive from that. In the GDP there is a very detailed table that is also imbedded in the Review Memo on page 18 where it shows the traffic impact that could be associated with the proposed community as it is development and populated and it specifies what improvements need to be done when and where to mitigate impacts as this community is populated with people who are working and living in Plainsboro. The applicant has indicated that it will make the traffic improvements that are required now based on the traffic analysis that was currently submitted and the future improvements when it becomes necessary by the benchmarks that are in the GDP.

Mr. John Clark was sworn in by Ms. Cecil and stated that his concern was the connection to Route 1 via a roadway to be constructed from South Brunswick. His house is on the State's Historic Preservation list since 1988 and on the National Historic Registry since 2018. When preservation was being considered there were comments about traffic from the NJDEP stating that a study was done indicating that more connections to Mapleton Road would be deleterious to the canal.

Ms. Coffey stated that there is no connection proposed to Mapleton Road.

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

**ROLL CALL:**

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

Mr. Greer asked Mr. Smith if the ordinance he references is a local or from South Brunswick.

Mr. Smith replied that it is a Plainsboro ordinance.

Mr. Yake stated that the applicant's response in providing the EIA is in response to the section of the Township Code Chapter 20 that deals with that.

There being no further questions or comments from the Board, it was MOVED by KEEVEY and SECONDED by DOSHI that the application be approved subject to all the conditions and recommendations contained in the review memo and all representations made by the applicant.

PLAINSBORO TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Page 14

June 16, 2025

**ROLL CALL:**

Yates	-	yes	Keevey	-	yes	Raturi	-	Absent
Spiegel	-	absent	Agarwal	-	absent	Maheshwari	-	Absent
<b>Cantú</b>	-	yes	Doshi	-	yes	Sharma	-	yes
Lehrhaupt	-	yes	Greer	-	yes			

Chair Lehrhaupt stated that a formal resolution will be prepared and presented for the Boards approval at a later date.

It was MOVED by YATES and SECONDED by KEEVEY to adjourn the meeting and with a simple voice vote the meeting was adjourned 9:57 pm .

Respectfully submitted,

---

Josi Easter, Board Secretary

Board Approval Date: \_\_\_\_\_