

**TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN
PLANNING BOARD
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY**

**REGULAR MEETING
October 3, 2018**

The regular meeting of the Township of Franklin Planning Board was held at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey and was called to order by Vice Chairman Maclvor at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read, the Pledge of Allegiance said and the roll was taken as follows:

PRESENT: Councilman Chase (arrived at 7:40 p.m.), Carl Hauck, Cecile Maclvor, Robert Mettler, Robert Thomas and Godwin Omolola

ABSENT: Alex Kharazi, Mustapha Mansaray, Charles Brown, Jennifer Rangnow and Chairman Orsini

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. James Clarkin, Board Attorney, Mark Healey, Planning Director, and Christine Woodbury, Planning & Zoning Secretary

DISCUSSION:

- **Clarkin & Vignuolo – October Retainer - \$833.33**

Mr. Thomas made a motion to approve the Vouchers as submitted. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Omolola

AGAINST: None

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Vice Chair Maclvor then opened the meeting to the public for discussion of anything related to Planning that was not the subject of a hearing that evening.

Seeing no one coming forward, Mr. Mettler made a motion to close the public portion of the meeting that evening and Mr. Omolola seconded the motion. All were in favor.

HEARINGS:

- **BRIDGE POINT SOMERSET, LLC / PLN-18-00007**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Bridgepoint Somerset, LLC. Amended Site Plan Approval in which the Applicant was proposing a revision to the previously approved site plan involving the construction of three (3) one-story warehouse buildings – two (2) buildings at 308,550 sq. ft. and one (1) building at 616,032 sq. ft. – where 1,098,689 sq. ft. was previously approved at 495 & 501 Weston Canal Road, Somerset; Block 516.01, Lots 7.02, 7.03, & 11.01 in the M-1 Zone.

Mr. Healey's Planning Report indicated that the Amended Site Plan either eliminates, continues, adds or modifies variances as follows:

The Amended Application *eliminated* the following previously granted variances:

- *Impervious Coverage*: 59.1% proposed (complies).

The Amended Application *continued* the following previously granted variances:

- *Landscaping*: 299 trees (subject to increase as per the testimony provided to the Board) proposed where 843 trees were required;
- *Driveway Width*: 54.8 ft. proposed, where a maximum of 36 ft. was required.

The Amended Application required the following new or modified variances:

- *Parking Lot Setback (Front)*: 50 ft. min. required – Troughly 30 ft. proposed (Randolph Rd.)
- *Number of Driveways*: Five (5) driveways proposed, where a maximum of two (2) driveways was permitted (4 previously approved).
- *Number of Freestanding Signs*: one (1) permitted per frontage – 4 signs proposed along Randolph Road.
- *Sign Area (Building-Mounted)*: 100 sq. ft. permitted – 191.5 sq. ft. proposed.
- *Vertical Dimension (Building-Mounted)*: 4 ft. permitted – 7.58 ft. proposed.
- *Parking Lot Aisle Width*: 22 ft. in width (Amazon parking lot).

Mr. Lanfrit told the Board that on June 6, 2018, he appeared on behalf of the Applicant to obtain a Site Plan approval to construct three (3) buildings totaling about 1,700,000 sq. ft. of space at the intersection of Weston Canal Rd. and Randolph Rd. He went on to explain that at the time of approval, they did not have any users for any of the buildings, but since that time had obtained a user for what was the 1,000,000 sq. ft. building with a demand for a building of 616,000 sq. ft. Mr. Lanfrit then stated that they were there that evening to seek amended site plan approval.

Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they would be placing into evidence an exhibit that showed the original approval on the right side and what was now being proposed on the left side. He explained that what was changing was the large building and the parking as well as associated needs for that building. He noted that the two buildings in the front on Weston Canal Rd. (approximately 300,000 sq. ft. each) both remain unchanged. Mr. Lanfrit then told the Board that there were some traffic issues that came up as a result of the Application and that they have had meetings with the Township Traffic Consultant, Somerset County and a joint meeting with the Township and Somerset County. He then noted that the Franklin Township Traffic Consultant issued a report indicating that they had addressed most of the items in the report that he was concerned with, but would be discussing a few that evening. Mr. Lanfrit then told the Board that Somerset County sent an e-mail stating that they had accepted the Applicant's numbers and was reviewing the proposal that included improvements to the County roads. He testified that any approval that they might get that evening from the Planning Board would be contingent upon whatever the County may ask the Applicant to do as far as roadway improvements on Weston Canal Rd.

Board Attorney, Mr. James Clarkin, told Vice Chair Maclvor that he had one housekeeping item to discuss before they went further with the Application. Mr. Clarkin asked Mr. Lanfrit for an acknowledgement that there were six (6) new or modified variances that were also part of the Application that evening. Mr. Lanfrit concurred with what was listed in Mr. Healey's Planning Report. He did indicate, however, that the impervious coverage was actually being reduced, the landscaping was not a variance, but a tree replacement requirement, driveway width was approved at the previous hearing and the number of driveways was also approved then as well, but that they were adding one (1) more driveway, which would require a variance.

Vice Chair Maclvor stated that she thought the parking lot setback was taken care of at the last hearing, and Mr. Lanfrit suggested that they swear in the Site Engineer in order to hear his testimony.

Mr. Robert Freud, Engineer employed with Dynamic Engineering, 1904 Main Street, Lake Como, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Freud then marked into evidence, as Exhibit A-1, an overall site rendering that showed what was originally proposed and approved at the June 6, 2018 hearing. He then marked into evidence as Exhibit A-2, also a site plan rendering, prepared on 10/2/2018. Mr. Freud indicated that the two buildings shown on the left side of both exhibits were identical and that nothing would be changing with them in the subject proposal. He further explained that the building sizes, number of loading docks, building orientation and location of buildings two (2) and three (3) would not have any changes. He did note, however, that there were a few minor modifications to the layout surrounding those two buildings.

Board Attorney, Mr. Clarkin, asked that the record reflect that Councilman Chase had just arrived at 7:40 p.m.

Mr. Freud then drew the Board's attention to Exhibit A-2, noting a minor modification to building #3 located on the southwesterly portion of that building that consisted of the removal of about 15-20 parking spaces due to a wetlands review. He then spoke about building #2 located the closest to Randolph Road. Utilizing Exhibit A-1, he showed the Board where the original Application showed a double loaded row of parking across the east side of building #2 with a total of 205 spaces, with about half of them facing Randolph Rd. He noted that a portion of those spaces had been located within the 50 ft. buffer; and in discussions at the June 6, 2018 hearing, they had agreed to eliminate the parking spaces from the front buffer. Mr. Freud then showed the Board Exhibit A-2, a result of the discussions, which showed a reduction to 33 parking spaces from just over 100 spaces that face Randolph Rd. and completely removing any parking spaces from the 50 ft. setback. He then told the Board that they then shifted the approximately 60 spaces that were eliminated from that front area were then shifted to the south side of the building and the driveway that connected to the main east/west drive aisle was then shifted about 350 ft. to the west as the drive aisle wrapped around the building. He then discussed their interpretation of the parking setback requirement of the ordinance that was discussed at the June 6, 2018 hearing. Mr. Freud then stated that when reading the Township Planner's letter, the interpretation included the parking spaces and the back-out aisles. He testified that the north/south drive aisle coming from building #2, which was allowed to be within the 50 ft. setback area, did cross over into that 50 ft. setback area. He then noted that the 33 parking spaces there faced the building, and not the roadway as well as putting significant landscaping across the frontage there, which was agreed to at the June 6, 2018 hearing, to help mitigate any encroachments that may exist. If a waiver was required by the Board for the encroachment of the drive aisle into the 50 ft. setback, Mr. Freud indicated that they could comfortably say that it was mitigated because the parking spaces don't face Randolph Road, and the additional landscaping provided screening for the activity above and beyond what the ordinance contemplated.

Mr. Healey stated that it was not an interpretation of the ordinance on his part, but his determination as the Zoning Officer. He explained that the ordinance stated that no parking area can be in the front yard setback, 50 ft. in this case, which includes the parking spaces as well as the drive aisle that serves the parking area, and would require a variance as presented. Mr. Healey then also offered, as a Planner, his testimony that he didn't know why they wouldn't be able to comply with 129 acres to work with and the ordinance was asking for a 50 ft. buffer along the street. He then discussed a water easement that was within the 50 ft. buffer area, which had a 10 or 20 ft. area that they could not plant within. Mr. Healey also added that the buffer was not only there to screen the parking area, but also to screen the very large industrial buildings. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Freud explained that there was a section of wetlands that restricted the northern portion of the property. He also stated that the 50 ft. front setback a building setback and that they had placed building #2 over 100 ft. from the roadway. Because of the distance of the building to the roadway and his testimony from the June 6, 2018 hearing regarding the smaller setbacks of other industrial buildings along Randolph Road, he

felt that the de minimus encroachment of the drive aisle into that setback area was a better alternative. He did indicate that they could pull the proposed landscaping out of the water easement area while still providing the screening there, which he felt was above and beyond the requirements of the ordinance.

Councilman Chase gave his remedy to the situation regarding the drive aisle being moved slightly to the west when beyond the building near the entrance of building #2 by removing a few parking spaces, but that they could move slightly with the drive aisle. By doing so, the Councilman stated that they could keep the drive aisle out of the 50 ft. setback area. Mr. Freud indicated that they would be willing to work with staff to mitigate the situation as much as possible in that area, but felt that it would still require a variance.

Mr. Thomas asked if there were going to be street trees planted, and Mr. Freud indicated that there would be a mix of evergreens and deciduous trees in the landscape area, but indicated that typical street trees would be planted where the water easement existed, which was not permitted. Mr. Thomas then inquired as to whether there would be some architectural features on the building that was fronting Randolph Road. Mr. Lanfrit reminded him about the discussion of the building features at the last hearing, noting that none of that would be changing with the new submission.

Mr. Freud then discussed building #1, the Amazon building, was now being reduced by just over a million sq. ft. to 616,00 sq. ft. since they now know their end user for the building. He stated that the building was oriented the same as the previously approved building and that loading was located on the north and south sides of this building, similar to the previous approval. As it was a smaller building, Mr. Freud stated that they were able to add additional trailer parking on the south side of the building as well as additional employee parking on the east side of the building. He stated that the previous approval had 230 parking spaces to the east and 305 spaces to the west, but now all employee parking would be on the east side of the building since they now know that the building will be a single tenant space, with 1,012 parking spaces. He also indicated that they were working with Amazon on the circulation on the site, starting with the truck and trailer deliveries in a clock-wise circulation pattern into the site. Mr. Freud then spoke about the driveway access at the south end of the site on Randolph Road, noting that it was in the same approximate location as previously approved, but was now a truck entrance only where it was previously approved to be a dual-use driveway for trucks and employee vehicles inbound and outbound. He then told the Board that there would be a gatehouse about 900 ft. inside the driveway where the trucks would be checked in and enter into the truck courtyard for truck staging and storage area along the south side of the building. Mr. Freud then indicated that the driveway would then circulate along the west side of the building and then the north side of the building, where there was sufficient turnaround area for a truck. He then testified that there was the main driveway so trucks could check out at an additional guard house to then proceed out of the complex. Mr. Freud also told the Board that the main drive aisle would also service a portion of buildings #2 and #3 as well as the employee lot on the east side of the property. He noted that employees would be able to utilize the center

driveway off of Randolph Road for ingress as well as left and right turn egress. He reiterated to the Board that they had planned a one-way circulation pattern for the building since Amazon has successfully utilized this system at other locations and felt that the one way traffic pattern, with a left hand turn lane into the employee parking area, was the safest and most efficient. Mr. Freud then discussed a loading area for mass transit users and for accessible parking spaces along the front of the building as well as pedestrian corridors both north/south along the first aisle of the building and east/west throughout the center of the parking lot. Mr. Freud then drew the Board's attention to the additional full movement driveway directly into the employee parking lot that required a variance and would access from Randolph Road. He noted that the other driveways were as presented at the last hearing as was the storm water management system that was designed and presented at the last hearing. Mr. Freud also stated that the grading was consistent with what was approved and the lighting only had some minor modifications with an increase from 1.2 foot candles to 1.78 foot candles for the enlarged employee parking area for safety reasons. He then spoke about the landscaping that had been carried over from the previous application and the additional of 276 trees to the overall site plan and primarily within the larger employee parking area. He then reiterated his discussion regarding truck traffic egress from the property, noting that there was a separated left and right turn egress movement there onto Randolph Road. Mr. Freud noted that the Amazon truck traffic would not traverse through buildings #2 and #3, and that those buildings would have independent access and would operate out of either the north driveway or the Weston Canal Driveway, which was a change from what was originally proposed and approved.

Mr. Freud then discussed the staff reports, noting that a large portion of the CME report (Engineering report) comments dealt with traffic, which he would defer to the Traffic Engineer. He noted that they could comply with all the other comments in the report, but wanted to discuss the impervious coverage comment brought up in comment #9. He wanted to inform the Board that the current proposal for impervious coverage was for 59.1%, which was now below the 60% allowed amount for the zone. He did state, however, that during the design development process with Amazon, they did ask for a few modifications that would bring the impervious coverage percentage up slightly, not to the level previously approved, but wanted the ability to work with staff to implement those things, to include pedestrian pathways from the two gatehouses towards the building for safety and appropriate safety areas around the trailer parking area. He then indicated that the impervious coverage to include those modifications would not rise to the 60.4% impervious coverage that was granted at the last hearing, but would most likely go over the 60% maximum.

Councilman Chase suggested that they could construct the pedestrian walkways out of pervious pavement. Mr. Freud stated that he could discuss that possibility with the Applicant. Mr. Healey indicated that there would still be a need for a variance, but the Board might feel that the use of pervious pavement mitigated the grant of the variance.

Mr. Freud then discussed Mr. Healey's Planning report, dated September 25, 2018. He indicated that they would be able to comply with all of the comments in the report. He

discussed the new or modified variances that were listed in Mr. Healey's report, noting that they had already spoken about the Parking Lot Setback and Number of Driveways. He then drew the Board's attention to the variance for the Number of Freestanding Signs, stating that the request for four (4) signs was for way-finding as the different driveways have different purposes and would each be within the 100 sq. ft. allowed and would comply with the height and setback requirements. Mr. Lanfrit added that there would be no signs on Weston Canal Road, although there would be a driveway there. Mr. Freud then discussed the variances requested for the building mounted sign, noting the guidelines to follow for size of signs in the zone. He then indicated that the sign on the Amazon building facing Randolph Road was 191.5 sq. ft., which was well below the 5% allowable, but is above the 100 sq. ft. maximum. He also added that the Amazon building was set back some 670 feet from Randolph Road, where 50 ft. was contemplated, and helps to mitigate the visual impact of that sign as it wouldn't appear as significant from Randolph Road, especially when a portion of it would be obscured by buildings #2 and #3. Along with the size of the sign, Mr. Freud also mentioned that they were requested a variance for Vertical Dimension, where 4 ft. was permitted and 7.58 ft. was proposed. He gave the same justification for the vertical dimension of the sign as for the size of the sign, again noting the distance to Randolph Road. Lastly, Mr. Freud mentioned the need for a variance for Parking Lot Aisle Width, with 22 ft. in width proposed for the Amazon parking lot where 26 ft. was required. He did state that the 22 ft. drive aisle widths were located within the one way circulation drive aisles with 60 degree angled parking spaces and didn't think a variance was necessary. Mr. Healey confirmed that Mr. Freud's statement was correct, and asked him to put the 60 degree parking space angle on the plans. Mr. Freud agreed to do so.

Mr. Freud was also qualified and licensed as a Planner and gave his opinion about the reasons the Board should grant the variances, utilizing the C(2) analysis, where the benefits outweigh the benefits.

Mr. Freud indicated that they would have no problem complying with the recommendations in the Sewerage Authority's report. He then told the Board that they had not had the opportunity to speak with Mr. Hauss from the Fire Prevention Dept. since the draft date of the letter, but was confident that they could comply with all of his recommendations.

Vice Chair MacIvor re-opened the discussion regarding the environmentally sensitive 50 ft. setback area. She questioned Mr. Freud as to whether they would be able to utilize pervious surface in the front parking area. Mr. Freud's opinion was that those types of surfaces were best suited for areas that were remote, less utilized parking areas because of the maintenance and the longevity of the surface. He also added that the pervious surfaces are a little bit rougher, and with employees coming and going, he felt that the smoother surface of normal asphalt pavement was a little safer condition for the employees. A discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. Lanfrit discussed the ways in which they had been working towards mitigating the situation. Mr. Healey suggested that they re-visit Councilman Chase's suggestion of angling the driveway in the front parking area. Mr. Freud stated that they would be able to make a driveway adjustment

at the corner of Building #2 that would have the most impact, aesthetically, to mitigate the encroachment of the 50 ft. setback.

Mr. Freud then discussed the meeting that he and Mr. Lanfrit had the evening prior with the Historic Commission, where the Commission endorsed the Site Plan that was before the Board that evening, without changes or conditions. He then discussed the Application to demolish the two structures that were currently on the subject property – one at the intersection with Weston Canal Road, and the one that was further west on Weston Canal Road. He explained that the discussion revolved around the removal of pre-existing, non-conforming uses from the property. Toward that end, Mr. Freud stated that they conducted Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) around the properties over the summer months where there had been small cemeteries located. He noted that any anomalies were located within the first 20-30 ft., with the proposed detention basin 100 ft. from that area, and another area of anomalies located in an area where the development was 50 ft. away. He indicated that the other discussion they had with the Historic Commission was regarding the residential structures themselves and what the aesthetic value of them was. He told the Board that it was determined that both residential structures probably did not have any aesthetic historic value, but they were asked to inventory the homes on the property prior to demolition and photograph and map out the floor plan of the buildings so there would be a record of the buildings that were there prior to demolition. Mr. Freud indicated that the Applicant was agreeable to doing so, which would satisfy the concerns of the Historic Commission. Mr. Lanfrit stated that they would issue minutes of the meeting

Vice Chair MacIvor asked how much distance there was between the employee entrance driveway and the truck entrance/exit driveway. Mr. Freud indicated that they were around 150 ft. apart. A discussion ensued about the possibility of the truck queuing possibly blocking off the employee entrance. Mr. Freud discussed the site circulation and how that would avoid any conflicts.

Board Attorney, Mr. Clarkin, re-qualified Mr. Freud from the last hearing as a Planner for the purposes of his planning testimony that evening. He then asked Mr. Freud to re-iterate the benefits to the Township that would support the C(2) variances for the benefit of the record. Mr. Freud mentioned the benefit of the signs for way-finding purposes. He noted that the benefit of the overall project coming into the Township was the utilization of the property in its capacity as an M-1 Zone, bringing with it 1,000+ employees just for Amazon alone. Mr. Clarkin then asked Mr. Freud to weigh the benefits and detriments for the Board regarding the C(2) analysis. Mr. Freud indicated that he felt that the benefits of the Application substantially outweighed any detriments, through the mitigation of the landscaping that was being provided as well as building setbacks from the roadways

Craig Peregoy, Traffic Engineer, employed with Dynamic Traffic, 245 Main Street, Suite 110, Chester, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Peregoy testified that he was not a witness at the previous hearing on June 6, 2018. He did indicate, however, that the Traffic Report that was presented

at that hearing was prepared by Dynamic Traffic by one of his associates. Mr. Peregoy stated that he was familiar with that report and he has personally generated a second Traffic Report as a result of the Application before the Board that evening. Mr. Peregoy testified that he had a meeting with Amazon to learn about their operations. He added that Amazon had a very good handle on the type of operation that was being proposed here. He stated that the proposed operation was going to be over two (2) shifts (7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 5:30 a.m.). Mr. Peregoy indicated that the 7:00 a.m. start was deliberate so as to have them coming to the site before peak travel hours with an hour and a half between the two shifts so there would not be a shift overlap. The Board discussed including a condition of maintaining the hour and a half in between shifts as well as having the shifts start and stop outside of peak travel hours as well. Mr. Lanfrit stated that he spoke to the representative from Amazon, and they can agree that the morning shift would not start any later than 7:00 a.m. as well as keeping the hour and a half between the two shifts to avoid any overlap. Mr. Peregoy then discussed the two seasons that Amazon has, including a peak season (November-December) and a non-peak season (January-October). He then indicated that the non-peak season would employ 550 employees per shift and the peak season with 675 employees per shift. He then spoke about his analysis, utilizing the employee counts for both seasons and the site circulation pattern on the property.

Mr. Peregoy then discussed what intersections he was asked to evaluate based on meetings with the Township Traffic Consultant and the County Traffic Consultant. He spoke about starting his analysis from the Weston Canal Road intersection all the way to the Rte. 287 ramps with the twin signals there, the Cottontail Rd. signal, the Apgar Drive unsignalized, L-shaped roadway, Weston Canal Road/Randolph Road intersection and Weston Canal Road and Schoolhouse Road intersection as well as the site driveways, Apgar Drive and Pierce Street and all the way down to Randolph Road and Schoolhouse Road. Mr. Peregoy stated that they did traffic counts at all the noted intersections, both weekday a.m. (6:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.) and weekday p.m. (4:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.) peak hours. He noted that they started their counts at 6:30 a.m. to be able to see what the impacts would be on their first shift start time as well as extending their analysis to 6:30 p.m. to assess the impacts to their second shift start time. He added that they also included the other projects that were either started or were in the works in the area, including four warehouse projects and the extension of the Canal Walk development and the Summerfields community along with the NJDOT recommended 1.75% background growth to existing volumes. Mr. Peregoy gave the Board an overview of his findings and conclusions were. He spoke about the peak season of the November-December time frame and identified some improvements that could be made and ways to better facilitate their site traffic beyond just the site driveways. The first area Mr. Peregoy addressed was the Weston Canal Road and Randolph Road intersection where they would make some improvements to the signalized intersection there by modifying the traffic signal on the radius on the right turn from Randolph Road onto Weston Canal Road to free up capacity on the roadway there and extend the left turn lane on Weston Canal Road to 550 ft. long to accommodate the largest queue from the peak time of Amazon's operations. Another area ripe for improvement would be the intersection of Randolph Road and Schoolhouse Road where they would signalize that

intersection. Mr. Peregoy indicated that they would have to prepare a signal warrant report to prove that a signal was needed there at that location. He then spoke about the intersection of Schoolhouse Road and Weston Canal Road where they would complete traffic signal timing changes. He did state, however, that the Weston Canal Road improvements would be subject to the County's approval, but said that they were agreeable up to that point and they just had to get into the details with them to complete the projects. Mr. Peregoy then suggested that they put a center left turn lane on Randolph Road in front of their facility since at 42 ft. wide was more than adequate to accommodate for that and would work with the Township's Traffic Engineer to make that work. Mr. Peregoy stated that the Township Traffic Engineer suggested that it might make sense to put a traffic signal at the main driveway for Amazon onto Randolph Road in the future to better accommodate for 675 employees exiting the premises at once time. He also said that Amazon would be amenable to doing a warrant analysis in the future once Amazon occupied the building and were operational, perhaps in November/December of 2020 to determine how the driveway was operating, along with a real time utility of the driveway. A discussion ensued among the Board, and Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, questioned whether there was potential for the number of employees to increase over time. Mr. Peregoy brought up the fact that the count was being very conservative, taking into account that every employee drove alone to work, that there was no carpooling and no mass transit and that no one ever called out sick or went on vacation. He added that those items would certainly compensate for those conservative estimates.

Mr. Thomas asked about their analysis of how Exit 12 would operate as a result of their development. Mr. Peregoy indicated that Exit 12 would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service during the worst case peak season. Mr. Thomas felt that the County or Amazon should be widening and restriping Weston Canal Road there to accommodate for the activity that already is occurring by motorists going south on Rte. 287 and queuing on the shoulder next to those intending to travel northbound on Rte. 287. He then stated that the situation would only get worse with the addition of all of the employees coming out of the Amazon site. Mr. Thomas also felt that the timing of the lights in that area would need to be adjusted. He added his concern for all of the truck traffic as well as the auto traffic the development would bring wouldn't negatively affect that interchange area. Mr. Peregoy stated that the counts they studied included the anticipated truck traffic in that area. He agreed with Mr. Thomas that they would fix the signal timing, but that the County would need to make that request to the NJDOT in order for that to be accomplished. Mr. Peregoy added that the County would not do that until Amazon was up and running and operational. Mr. Lanfrit then added that they were awaiting the County report regarding the Traffic Study that was submitted to them. He also told the Board that the Township now had a Traffic Consultant through CME who could express those concerns to the County and have the County look at those issues. A discussion among the Board ensued.

Mr. Peregoy then addressed the staff reports, noting that most of the comments on the CME (Engineering) report had already been addressed and that they would be able to address any of the remaining traffic comments as discussed in testimony that evening.

Mr. Peregoy then addressed Mr. Healey's Planning report as it related to traffic. Mr. Healey asked whether there were going to be any right-of-way takings or any roadway widening that would have to occur for any of the suggested improvements. Mr. Peregoy stated that Weston Canal Road would be widened to accommodate for the proposed longer left hand turn lane and the radius. He added that at the intersection of Randolph and Schoolhouse to make the right turn from Randolph onto Schoolhouse, the radius might need to be widened in order that a truck could accomplish that. He added that they didn't have a full survey at that location, but that it didn't look like it would require any right-of-way taking there. Mr. Healey suggested to the Board that the noted improvements would have to be done prior to the grant of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO). Mr. Lanfrit indicated that once they receive the CO, they still had to fully fit out the building and have full employment rolls first. He stated that they would need to be fully operational first in order to determine whether some of the improvements listed would actually need to be completed upfront. He stated that they would have to bond for them and would agree to do them, but didn't think they were all necessary before obtaining the CO. Mr. Healey then stated that he felt that the improvements would definitely need to be completed before the impact traffic occurs. He suggested that there could be some language they could work on for the Board's consideration to include in the Resolution.

Vice Chair MacIvor then spoke about a left hand turn queue lane on Schoolhouse and wondered how long it was going to be. Mr. Peregoy stated that they would make it long enough to accommodate the maximum capacity and would work with staff for their approval.

Mr. Mark Griffin, Transaction Manager with Amazon, 300 Boren Avenue North, Seattle, WA 98109, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Griffin told the Board that a Transaction Manager oversees site selection and negotiations for the facilities they operate. He stated that he had been involved with several Amazon facilities in the past three years in New Jersey (Teterboro, Edison, Cranbury, West Deptford, etc.). Mr. Griffin then went on to describe the type of Amazon facility they were proposing here in Franklin Township. He told the Board that the center being proposed was considered a Receive Center and would receive product in bulk from their suppliers, breaking that product down into smaller batches for distribution to fulfillment centers in Amazon's network where it is ultimately fulfilled for customer orders. Mr. Griffin then testified that they didn't store product in the subject facility, but that it comes in for a very short time and is broken down to be shipped to fulfillment centers. He then added that they operated a similar facility in Florence, NJ. Mr. Griffin then went on to reiterate Mr. Peregoy's testimony regarding the timing of the shifts (10-1/2 hour shifts). He told the Board that their internal build-out included break rooms for employees that had vending machines and other options for employees who do not bring their own meals. He also testified that most employees stay on-site for the entirety of their shift and have an internal commute trip reduction program that encourages employees who choose to either carpool or take advantage of transit so that there were as few single occupancy trips generated as possible. He added that they also worked closely with the local transit agencies to make sure the employees were aware of the options to get to and

from the site should they choose not to drive their own cars. Mr. Griffin then stated that they did not have any employee growth that was anticipated, but did anticipate executing a 15-year lease at the subject property so he couldn't say with certainty that there wouldn't be any changes in employee count. Mr. Griffin then gave the Board the benefit of a description of the inner workings at the facility. He stated that they would have material handling equipment that would be installed at the subject location and handled movement of the product within the facility.

Vice Chair MacIvor asked Mr. Griffin if Amazon put up any signs to discourage any unnecessary idling. Mr. Griffin stated that they had appropriate way-finding signage to enable trucks to efficiently enter and exit the property as well as adequate space for queuing on-site.

Mr. Thomas asked for the number of trucks entering and exiting the facility each day. Mr. Griffin indicated that he didn't have the exact numbers in front of him, but that the numbers were included in the traffic study. He did testify that the truck traffic was spread out throughout the day, both during their peak season and their non-peak season. Mr. Thomas then asked Mr. Griffin what were the preferred routes of the trucks coming and going to and from the facility. Mr. Griffin indicated that those preferences would be included in the traffic study and that he would defer to Mr. Peregoy. Mr. Peregoy came forward and stated that the majority of the trucks they have routed to Route 287 to interchange 12 (75%) and approximately 25% would go elsewhere, likely to exit 10 via Pierce Street to Davidson Avenue to Easton Avenue. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Mettler asked if all of the truck traffic to and from the site would be 18—wheel semi trucks, and Mr. Griffin indicated that nearly all would be the large, 18 wheeled trucks.

Mr. Omolola stated that it would be prudent for Amazon to get in touch with the New Brunswick Transit Authority to help move some of their staff to their facility. Mr. Peregoy indicated that there was also the DASH line and another route that lets riders off on Cottontail Lane and was definitely something that they would encourage. He did state that the County would have to accommodate the routes to allow them to go to their location.

Mr. Thomas opened a discussion regarding the restriction of truck traffic on Township roadways. Board Attorney, Mr. Clark, discussed with Mr. Lanfrit regarding the obligation that he felt Amazon had to demonstrate that the proposed project would not have any substantial negative impacts upon the public good. Mr. Lanfrit stated that they had no problem in directing their trucks to utilize Exit 10 or Exit 12 as a condition of any approval.

Mr. Clarkin asked Mr. Peregoy what fulfillment centers the truck traffic from the subject location would be travelling to. Mr. Peregoy indicated that the trucks would be travelling to fulfillment centers across the Northeast. Mr. Clarkin then asked why they have a 1,012 car parking lot if the peak season employee count per shift was only 675. Mr.

Griffin answered that they were just taking advantage of the site area of building #1. He also added that they do get visitors and vendors throughout the day, approximately a few dozen a day. Mr. Clarkin suggested that they could consider “banking” some of their parking spots for future use. Mr. Clarkin asked Mr. Griffin, as a voluntary condition of any approval, would Amazon agree to abide by the two shift times testified to earlier of 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 5:30 a.m. Mr. Griffin stated that those shift times were their intention and agreed to that as a condition, but requested the ability to revisit those hours with the Board should their operations change in the future. Mr. Griffin confirmed with Mr. Clarkin that no member of the public would be visiting the site, to return an item, or for any other reason. Mr. Clarkin then inquired about whether there would be cooking of food at the facility, and Mr. Griffin indicated that there would be microwaves available in the break rooms to heat food. Mr. Clarkin then asked how long the employees get for breaks during their shift and Mr. Griffin stated that the employees get a couple 15-minute breaks as well as an hour break for lunch. Mr. Clarkin then asked for clarification regarding a possible shuttle bus. Mr. Griffin indicated that they hadn’t had any specific discussions yet with the local transit agencies, but with every site they operate, particularly in New Jersey, their transit dept. contact the local transit agencies to identify transit options for employees who would like to take mass transit to work.

Mr. Omolola asked if they would be working on the weekends, and Mr. Griffin testified that they operate 7 days a week.

Mr. Freud, Site Engineer, was recalled by Mr. Lanfrit to testify. He asked Mr. Freud to opine on whether he still believed that the benefits outweigh any detriments after hearing the testimony of the other two witnesses. He stated that he felt that the discussion regarding the limitation of the exits for the truck traffic just furthers the mitigation of any negative impacts and, therefore, the benefits of the Application do outweigh any negative impacts.

Councilman Chase asked whether they could have a commitment to bank some of the proposed parking spaces, possibly 100 spaces, from the Amazon lot. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they could agree to bank some spaces, but did not want to make a commitment to a specific amount because they would have to go back to Operations to see what they would feel comfortable with and would get to as close to 100 spaces as possible.

Mr. Mettler then made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Mr. Vincent Dominach, Economic Development Director for the Township, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Dominach discussed the legitimacy of concern regarding truck traffic brought up by Mr. Thomas. He also told the Board that at the meetings, the Traffic Consultants all agreed to be ultra conservative and show the worst case condition in every possible manner, but felt that any truck driver would utilize the Exit 10 or Exit 12. Even though the issues on Weston Canal Road with queuing in a double

lane for the north and south bound lanes of Rte. 287 have nothing to do with the Applicant, he indicated that he and Mr. Healey could go to the County to present those concerns. Mr. Dominach then discussed the issue with the buffering, and the Applicant had agreed to work with Township staff in order to work on that. He also explained that the Applicant had spent a lot of time and money to address all of the concerns the Board has had that evening as well as all of the concerns not discussed because Township and County staff as well as the Engineer had already addressed. Finally, he testified that there was a permitted use before the Board with an Applicant that had shown tremendous ability in the last few months to work diligently with the Township over and above what a typical Applicant would do. He encouraged the Board to take all of these things into consideration and urged them to approve the Application.

Mr. Omolola added that Mr. Dominach failed to mention the economic benefit to the Township in employing over 1,000 employees and increasing patronage of the local businesses.

Mr. Dominach also added that the Applicant shared traffic data and information from their many other locations within New Jersey.

Vice Chair Maclvor then stated that she had been informed that they would be able to give Preliminary approval until the Applicant obtains information regarding the banking of parking spaces. Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, stated that the Board could grant Preliminary or Preliminary and Final Approval that evening if there were one or more issues of concern and want some clarity or more definition of, i.e., what the County was going to do regarding the traffic issues or banked parking. Mr. Dominach indicated that the Board doesn't normally just give Preliminary approval, but typically leaves it up to staff to iron out the details. He then encouraged the Board to grant both Preliminary and Final approval and let staff work it out. Mr. Healey then gave his recommendations to the Board, reiterating Mr. Dominach's testimony. He suggested that if some change was made to the proposal that would substantively change what was presented, then there could be some language placed in the Resolution that would indicate that they would have to come back before the Board.

Mr. Lanfrit then stated that they would agree to "bank" up to 100 parking spaces, but no less than 50 parking spaces and would work with staff to get to a definitive number based on need, along with providing the justification. He also indicated that they would do what the County dictates they had to do, but would ask for Preliminary and Final Site approval so they would not have to come back before the Board unless there was an issue. He then gave his summation remarks.

A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Mettler made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Mr. Thomas then made a recommendation for the Resolution that the parking that was banked be the ones closest to Randolph Road.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to grant the Preliminary and Final approval for the Application, with the 5 variances required and including all the conditions discussed during the hearing and working with staff to meet those conditions. Also included was banking up to 100 parking spaces nearest to Randolph Road and redesigning the one entrance with the landscaping and directing truck traffic to Exits 10 and 12 on Rte. 287. Additionally, all of the conditions of the prior approval on June 6, 2018 would be made in full force and effect unless the testimony given that evening indicated otherwise. Applicant will also obtain all of the necessary governmental approvals and comply with the Historic Commission requests, including but not limited to inventorying the two buildings on the site that would be demolished. Applicant will also enter into a developer's agreement with the Township which was satisfactory to the Township. Applicant has agreed to the condition that there would be two shifts only at the location, commencing from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and from 7:00 p.m. to 5:30 a.m., and giving the Applicant opportunity to return to the Board if it would like to alter the starting and ending times or the number of shifts. Applicant will also comply with all of the recommendations and the CME report concerning traffic. There will be two warrant analyses performed, one done immediately at the Randolph Road and Schoolhouse Lane intersection and one at the main Amazon driveway and Randolph Road will be performed after the Amazon facility was in full operation at a time to be designated by staff, perhaps looking at November or December of 2020. In the event any traffic signals or other traffic improvements offsite were constructed, they shall be at the sole cost and expense of the Applicant. As of this point in time, no right-of-way dedication was anticipated, but in the event that it is, then the land will be given either by fee simple, permanent or temporary construction easement, as is necessary, with no consideration being required from any governmental entity. Traffic improvements must be completed before the facility was fully operational and the Applicant must give a monthly report as to its progress so that the Township could follow along. Applicant has voluntarily agreed that there would be mandated truck routes, and these would be spelled out in detail in the Resolution. Applicant will bank anywhere between 50 and 100 parking spaces and must be satisfactory to the staff and must be those closest to Randolph Road first. In the event any governmental approval materially alters the impacts of this Application, or materially changes the Applicant's plans or the findings of facts or conclusions of this Board, then the Applicant will be required to return to this Board. Whether it will be a material impact will be in the opinion of staff. Applicant testified that they wanted to retain the Impervious Coverage variance based upon the testimony given during the hearing. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Omolola

AGAINST: None

COMMITTEE REPORTS

No reports were discussed.

WORKSESSION/NEW BUSINESS:

There was no work session or new business discussed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

The Board did not enter into an Executive Session that evening.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Omolola made a motion to adjourn the regular meeting at 10:08 p.m. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary
October 19, 2018