

TOWNSHP OF LOPATCONG  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

December 19, 2019

Chairman VanVliet called the Planning Board Meeting to order. The meeting was held in the Municipal Building located at 232 S. Third Street, Phillipsburg, New Jersey.

Prayer was offered followed by the Oath of Allegiance

Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided indicating the time and place of the meeting in accordance with Chapter 231 of the Public Laws of 1975 by advertising a Notice in The Star Gazette and The Express-Times and by posting a copy on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building.”

Present: Members Coyle, Pryor, Weeks, Mayor Mengucci, Vice-Chairman Fischbach, Chairman VanVliet, Member Liptak. Also present were Planner Ritter, Attorney Bryce and Engineer Wisniewski.

**Old Business:**

**Minutes** – November 25, 2019 – Approve on motion by Mayor Mengucci, seconded by Vice-Chairman Fischbach. All in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

**Ordinance No. 19-17 – Chapter 199** – Storm Water Ordinance for review and approval. Motion to approve Chapter 199 and send back to Council for further consideration by Vice-Chairman Fischbach, seconded by Member Weeks. Roll call vote:

AYES: Members Coyle, Pryor, Weeks, Mayor Mengucci, Vice-Chairman Fischbach, Chairman VanVliet, Member Liptak.

NAYS: None

**Strykers Road Associates, LLC – Block 100, Lots 6.06, 6.07 and 7** – Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with Bulk Variance Relief.

Please see attached transcript of the hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret B. Dilts  
Planning Board Secretary

Chairman VanVliet – Is the applicant here?

Attorney Peck – Yep it is.

Member Pryor – Mr. Chairman, with your permission, can I ask Mr. Peck a question?  
The applicant is who tonight?

Attorney Peck – Strykers Road Associates.

Member Pryor – And can you tell me everybody that has an interest in that?

Attorney Peck – It's, quite honestly, it's some LLC's but I forget the people who make up  
Stryker Road Associates.

Member Pryor – I'm careful about conflict of interest. I'd like that on the record, please.

Attorney Bryce – Raise your right hand. Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you are  
about to give the Board is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

Rob DeBeer – Yes.

Attorney Bryce – Okay. Please state your name for the record.

Rob DeBeer – My name is Rob DeBeer. I am the Director of Peron Development. One of the  
50% owners of this joint venture is an entity that is owned 100% by Mike Perrucci.

Member Pryor – And who is the other half?

Rob DeBeer – The other half – is it Jim himself as the individual. So, the other half of this  
ownership group is an entity that's owned by Jim Petrucci.

Member Pryor – Okay, so those are the two owners. All right, I am good; I have no conflicts.

Member Weeks – I'd just like to add something. Jim, my son is a commercial realtor, all right, I don't believe he (inaudible) this side of the fence over here, all right, that I know of at all. I just want that out on the books to protect myself and things so. All right, fair enough.

Attorney Bryce – Does he have a business relationship with

Member Weeks – I don't know if he has with any of them; he deals with it all the time; I don't know where the lines drawn.

Attorney Peck – I don't think like being a general being you know, a real estate agent or broker generally would.

Attorney Bryce- No, not generally.

Attorney Peck – All right, thank you Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, and the public. For the record, my name is Mark Peck. I am an Attorney with the Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt, and Cappelli Law Firm on behalf of the applicant, Stryker Road Associates, LLC. Before, we proceed any further; we do need to have a completeness determination made. As you recall, we were here last month and were deemed incomplete. There were some deficiencies and what not, and we've used the intervening time we hope wisely, making refinements to the plan and our thanks do go out to the Board's professionals who have been very gracious all along helping us refine this plan. So, at this point, you know, we've submitted everything according to the checklist except with preliminary; there's two items that we believe are not applicable. That's Item 47 which is the location and nature of storage facilities and Item 54 which is stage of development which there are no stages, there's just one; Phase I and that's it and then on final there are five items that we don't believe are applicable; that's Item 1 which is the approved preliminary site plan, 2 drawings from the preliminary site plan, 3 information for the preliminary site plan for post preliminary approval modifications all of which is to provide preliminary and final application don't apply and then 55 which is the present and proposed number of units also not applicable, however, we are looking for two checklist waivers from the final which is Item 33 which is the profiles of existing and proposed storm drainage and Item 58 which is a list of site improvements by item and quantity so if the Board has any questions relating to those two checklist waiver requests or the items that we believe are not applicable, we do have our engineer here who can give testimony to that regard, otherwise we ask that you deem the application complete to proceed.

Chairman VanVliet – Adam, .. checklist from you agreed to

Engineer Wisniewski – Right, we agreed to the determinations and non-applicability for the preliminary and final site plan detailed checklist. Some of those items will be addressed in, you know, if the Board is so moved to approve the application in a resolution of compliance submission. Board and the other items that were requested to be waived, this ..in the process would also be addressed during resolution, would have to be addressed. For completeness purposes, we would be supportive of waiving these items.

Member Pryor – Yeah, I would ask the engineer a question, things like the takeoff, you would effectually need that to prepare an estimate for bonding and so on

Engineer Wisniewski – Correct.

Member Pryor – but that could be handled down the road.

Engineer Wisniewski – Exactly,

Member Pryor – Okay.

Engineer Wisniewski – that’s frequently how it’s done so

Member Pryor – All right.

Engineer Wisniewski – So once the plans are finalized then, the applicant’s professionals can prepare those for those estimates.

Chairman VanVliet – George, do you have any comments or

Planner Ritter – Not on completeness, no.

Chairman VanVliet – Anymore questions from the Board? Hearing none, I’ll entertain a motion to deem the application complete.

Member Pryor – I’ll make the motion.

Chairman VanVliet – Do I hear a second.

Member Weeks – Second.

Chairman VanVliet – Roll call Beth, please.

Secretary Dilts – Yes.

AYES: Member Coyle, Pryor, Weeks, Mayor Mengucci, Vice-Chairman Fischbach, Chairman VanVliet, Member Liptak.

NAYS: None

Attorney Peck – All right. Thank you very much. Now that we've been deed complete, notice has been published and served with the necessary affidavits and proofs have been submitted to the Board's secretary. I understand everything's in order, so this Board does have jurisdiction to proceed tonight. We are seeking preliminary and final site plan approval which bulk variance and waiver relief to construct a 511,200 square foot warehouse on a 66 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> acre tract located at 39 to 41 Strykers Road here in the Township. It is also known as lots 6.06, 6.07 and 7 in Block 100. This is in your ROM or Research, Office, Manufacturing Zone District. This particular property is located out on the westerly side of Strykers Road on the Greenwich Township border at the Lopatcong Creek. It's currently agricultural property. There's a residence and some farm buildings on a portion of the property as well as a JCP & L right-of-way...of the property. Up to 10,000 square feet of the proposed warehouse would be office space and both the proposed warehouse and the office use are permitted in the ROM Zone District. Although it is a permitted use, we are requesting three bulk variances as well as five design waivers. The bulk variances that we are seeking are from Section 243-49D which has to do with the minimum front yard parking set back where your ordinance requires a minimum of 75 feet and we're proposing setbacks of between 56.1 and 74.1 feet. We're also looking for a variance from the provisions of Section 243-49G5 which is the open space provided within parking fields. We have 59, your ordinance would require 59,900 square feet of open space within the parking lots, we're proposing 14,760 square feet and finally we're looking for a variance from the provisions of Section 243-49G2 which has to do with shade trees within the parking areas. Your ordinance would require 59 shade trees to be planted within the parking lot and although we propose to plant 82 trees on site, only 24 of those would be located within the curbed islands. We're also looking for, as I indicated five design waivers; the first is from Section 243-46C1 that has to do with the maximum driveway opening where your ordinance limits it to 25 to 40 feet. We're seeking an opening of 136 feet. The next is from Section 243-48B3C which has to do with trees and parking lot and parking islands; there's 38 islands, your ordinance would require 38 trees; one in each island. We're proposing 15 islands to have trees. We're planning, you know, we're providing them where we think it's practical and possible but there'll be more testimony relating to that. The third waiver we are looking for is from Section 243-48B5 and that has to do with sidewalks in parking areas with greater than 100 parking spaces; we're not proposing any sidewalks for this warehouse use. The fourth waiver is from Section 243-48B6 that requires a 30-foot wide drive isle to be adjacent to the primary building; we're proposing to have some parking between the building and the fire land and also a 24-foot wide fire lane, not a 30-foot and the final waiver we're looking for is from Section 243-48B7 which has to do with maximum slope within 200 feet of an intersecting street. Your ordinance requires four percent maximum

slopes for the roadway and we're looking for greater than four percent in parts of that area and, of course, we'll seek any other variances or waivers that are identified during the course of the hearing and again we've received, you know, the feedback over, you know, from the filing of this application and we have worked to address the site issues and we believe that we are presenting a strong and conforming application in an appropriate location that will prove to be a great benefit to the Township's commercial base. We do have a team here to provide testimony on behalf of the application. We have Brad Bohler our Engineer, we have John Wichner who is our Traffic Engineer, our Architect Carme Seminara and finally our Planner John McDonough and you've already met at least one of our representatives from Stryker Road Associates should you have any, you know, operational type questions for them. So, without any further ado, I'd like to call my first witness. I don't know if you want to do a group swearing or

Attorney Bryce - Just one at a time.

Attorney Peck – just one at a time, that's fine. So, Brad Bohler.

Attorney Bryce – Do you swear and affirm that you are about to give this Board is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Engineer Bohler – I do.

Attorney Bryce – Okay. Just please state your name for the record.

Engineer Bohler – Bradford Bohler – B-o-h-l-e-r.

Attorney Peck – Brad, will you give the Board the benefit of your educational and professional background?

Engineer Bohler – Yes, I have a Bachelor and master's in science from Purdue University in Civil Engineering. I am a licensed Engineer in the State of New Jersey as well as seven other states up and down the east coast. I've been a professional engineer for over ten years and working in the civil engineering field for just under 15 years.

Attorney Peck – And you've been accepted. I'm sorry, my .. , you've been accepted as an expert in New Jersey by court...

Engineer Bohler – Yes in over 85 towns in New Jersey.

Attorney Peck – Very good and you're familiar with the Lopatcong Township Zoning Ordinance?

Engineer Bohler – I am, yes.

Attorney Peck – And you're involved in the preparation of the plans that you're going to present tonight?

Engineer Bohler – Yes, I am.

Attorney Peck – I would move Mr. Bohler as an expert in the field of civil engineering.

Chairman VanVliet - ... we agree.

Attorney Peck – Very good. All right, the floors yours Brad.

Engineering Bohler – So for the first exhibit I have up for the Board tonight, I marked it A-1 previously with today's date. It's an Aerial Plan showing the current site configuration the actual site that we're proposing tonight. Again, it's Block 100, Lots 6.06, 6.07 and 7. It's showing you lot in the middle of the page labeled with the site. To the bottom of the page is the south, so in a dark black line running diagonally from the right side down to the left side, that's the border of Greenwich and Lopatcong sites, so our sites fully within Lopatcong. Strykers Road is to the east side so the right side of the page of the site has solar panels up further, further east. Directly to the north is the yard for our property. South again, I mentioned, is Greenwich and then to the west is Rt. 22 so that's the four-lane highway to the left side of the property. Overall, the site is 66.7 acres. There was mention of a JCP&L easement so it's a little hard to see but the easement does run north/south and there are some several other smaller easements that run east/west along the creek itself and the Lopatcong Creek actually does split the site on the lower half of the property. As the Board maybe familiar, the site is topographically challenged so to the north side of the property down to the Lopatcong Creek is about a 90-foot grade differential on that side. Across the stream on the south side about a 20-foot differential in grade mainly from Rt. 22 at the intersection down to the stream in that area, so, a little bit flatter on the opposite side of the stream but really, we're going to focus on the north side of the property tonight. Currently the site is farmed both sets of properties; 6.06 and 6.07 which is the north and then also to the south, Lot 7 are farmed regularly before the application. So, moving onto the proposal. I marked this exhibit A-2. This exhibit shows is our overall site plan; it's Sheet C-12 in our set. Then we rendered it to show the landscaping on the plan itself so we can see the overall development. This is orientation, just let me get to the last exhibit which will show (plans hitting the microphone) north is to the left of the page with Strykers Road going along the top of the page just for purposes of presentation so our proposal tonight is a 511,000 square foot warehouse. Right now, the proposed 10,000 square feet of office and that could range, based on tenants

which we don't have yet, up to about 20,000 of office space depending on what we have user wise within the facility.

Member Pryor – That's within the 511?

Engineer Bohler – Yes, so the actual square footage will be still 511 square feet. The office feet might flex inside of the after we ..tenants for that. The height for the building is approximately 51 feet that's based on the average grade around the site so, as the warehouse, and on this plan to the west, or the bottom of the plan, that's where the loading docks will be so that's about four feet lower than the actual first floor around the site. The front yard setback which is hinged at the corner of the eastern side of the property near the bend in Strykers Road 77.9 feet. The majority of the rest of the facility is about 200 feet from Strykers Road along that so, the pinch point is more of an angle at that location. To the north, we haven't, it's near a property of 130 feet approximately to the corner and then to the Greenwich border to the south here, that would be almost 700 feet; 750 feet across the river to that location. So, the goal is to keep the warehouse in the north corner along Strykers Road. There's a few reasons for that; one is that JCP&L easements we mentioned previously, can't put any structures in that area so that essentially eliminates the ability to put any developments in the western side of the property and the Lopatcong Creek which does have a C-1 buffer on it, so the goal for our proposal is to stay out of that buffer and let that naturalize again back to existing conditions. Access to the site under the current proposal the Board has is via full movement driveway on the north side on Strykers Road and then a full movement in driveway on the south side with a right turn only exit movement. One of the comments that Maser had in their review letter was a discussion about our proposal for the northern driveway and the site distances at that location, so, we've been working with Maser over the past several days; we met with them yesterday and had a couple of e-mail exchanges in a call today and our agreement as part of this application would be to amend the driveway at the northern side to allow trucks and cars to come in but then split the exit movement so that cars can only exit at this location. So, trucks would all have to go down to the southern driveway when they leave and that's a proper circulation pattern that when you look through trucks they typically want to come in into the truck port on the north side in this situation and back into so they can see on their mirror on their driver's side; it's easier for the truckers to back their cars, or their trucks and their cabs into the loading docks themselves. One of the waivers we are requesting for dimension is the width of the driveway; 136 feet is proposed and that is to allow for trucks to property maneuver through the driveways. The maximum requirement is 40 feet so a proper maneuver with a radius of 40 feet or so for trucks allows for proper access and that way the trucks won't pop over the curb when they go through entrances or exits. From a circulation prospective, we do have two-way circulation around the facility, 30-foot drive isles for the trucking area so for the north and I think for the truck courts, a wider drive out and then 30-foot driveways to the south. The car parking which is the east of the building and between Strykers Road just the 24 foot drive isle on those locations which is in accordance



with the ordinance with the exception of fire apparatus which we did run a fire truck through the truck court and as well as the car parking and the fire truck for the Township does allow for circulation of truck freeway. From a parking perspective, we have 489 A seventh parking spaces proposed along the eastern portion of the building along Stryker Road. The design of the parking spaces is such that the actual parking lot is about seven feet lower at its highest point to the road along Strykers Road and then as we get further north, the grade does go up in elevation at that location. The parking lot does drop about 15 feet below grade so as you come southbound on Strykers Road, the expectation is you wouldn't see the actual parking spaces when enhanced with landscaping and as you come north on Strykers Road, you would see it for a short portion but it's essentially is will be hidden down below the grade as you come up in that area. Mr. Peck mentioned a variance for parking setback, and we do have a 56-parking set back along, again the pinch point on Strykers Road where the bend does happen. Most of the parking spaces are 74 feet, just below the requirement for variances at that location. There are also 109 trailer parking spaces along the left side of the property so opposite the loading docks, opposite the truck court, there are spaces for trailers to be stored in that location and we did provide additional buffering to the south so that those trailers spaces will be buffered from cars coming northbound on Strykers Road. The other variance we have for parking spaces is with regards to square footage in and around the parking spaces, so we do calculate 15,000 square feet. It is a limited area around the outside of the parking spaces and really within the islands. We do have over the requirement within the general area of the parking lot so, you know, to the south, to the west of the trailer spaces and then also to the east of the car parking but because the ordinance stipulates a certain area to be calculated, we do, we do have a variance for that even though we technically do have the square footage ... We do have a waiver as well for the number of trees in the islands so we did add as many trees as we could within the landscape islands along the car parking area as well as the truck area. There are some areas where we couldn't add trees because of lights or utilities; the Fire Department wanted a couple of hydrants throughout the parking lot area, so we added those which limited us to put the trees with actually within the islands. We did make an attempt to keep the same trees that we needed to have for ordinance and put them all on the outside of the, of the actual parking spaces so the intent of number of trees is there, we just don't have them in the exact locations that they need to be at. From a loading perspective, all the loading on the warehouse would be to the west side of the building along the bottom of this page. There was a comment about, in Maser's letter, about trash removal, typically when you have facility like this a compactor or a trash dumpster is put within the loading dock area, so it just blends in with the trailers. If the Board so inclined, we can show areas for refuse enclosures that would be banked if the tenant needs that. We don't feel it's necessary as part of the operations of the warehouse but if that's at the Board's request, we can certainly comply with that request. So that takes me through parking and loading. I'm going to jump into storm water a little bit. So, I mentioned during existing conditions, the site drains from the north and south substantially so we based our storm water basins along the west and south sides of the property and kind of followed natural grading do down towards the stream. We do meet NJDEP criteria for all storm water

management basins. We expect to actually having our DEP permit in hand by next Friday. That's their due date; they've committed to that based on correspondence today with the DEP and as part of our application both the Highlands and DEP have asked us re-naturalize the 300 foot buffer for Lopatcong Creek so with the exception of a discharge point that we have for storm water, we are naturalizing that as well as putting it within maintenance easement so that it's preserved for the DEP for Highlands and also the County asked us for access to that easement ..comply with the County's request as well within that location. Overall, the cover for the site it's about 40 percent where 65 is allowed so it's far below the requirement for the ordinance. We do have a waiver from storm pipe velocity as far as ordinance; the requirement's three feet per second. We propose two feet per second which is standard in the industry. It's also a requirement for RSIS so we're requesting that waiver to meet the criteria. I believe ...agreed that that was an acceptable waiver based on our design. From a utility's perspective, both gas and water are north of our site. We're going to extend those services down Strykers Road approximately 1400 feet for water; approximately 1000 feet for gas. Electric ..as well will be brought to our site up in that area and we do provide a sanitary sewer pump station on our site that pumps up all that up across the train tracks to the other side of the highway similar to what Berry Plastic did we would tie into the same, the same actual manhole at that location. Our proposal is for 12,500 gallons per day of flow based on our employee count and that would be, that is confirmed to be acceptable from a flow perspective to the treatment plant in that location. Let landscaping last and I'll go through the review letters but from a lighting perspective we .. LED lights; they're 30 feet lights, freestanding lights up front. The building ....lights are approximately 15 feet high and they're fully compliant plan from an ordinance perspective. There was a request in the Maser letter to indicate when and if we could dim the lights. We would agree to dim the lights during off hours so, if there's an user is occupied within this area, we'll fit lights out with dimmable areas and they'll typically turn off one hour after that users closed and then they'll turn back on about 15 minutes or so before they open up again so they'll be on overnight for safety purposes but they'll be dimmed down to about 50 percent of the .... So overall the development does cover a pretty substantial landscape package based on DEP criteria. So, of the site, about 45 percent will be converted to ...conditions so that's underneath the JCP&L easement and then within the buffer area. That was a request of Highlands and DEP, so they'll be grasses and flowering areas in those locations. The mowed essentially twice throughout the life and then they'll revegetate back, back to natural conditions. Besides that, onsite, we have all native species based on DEP criteria. So, we have just under 800 trees on side; that's evergreens, ornamentals, insidious trees just over 2500 evergreen and deciduous and just under a 1000 ground covers and grasses that are in this area. We're within our development area; that excludes what's outside in the meadow condition. So that's the summary of the project. With regards to Maser's review letter, with civil engineering and geotechnical, I can go through each of the comments but in summary I believe we can address all the comments within that letter and if there's anything I missed testimonial wise, I can certainly address it right now from your perspective.

Member Pryor – Mr. Bohler

Engineer Bohler – Yes.

Member Pryor – I’m sure someone will cover the proofs later, but could you just discuss the one variance you’re looking at? It’s a 75-foot setback, correct and you’re allowed to have parking in the front yard as long as you maintain that 75 feet

Engineer Bohler – Correct.

Member Pryor – and there’s a couple of spots you come up short and it varies from like 19 feet to like a foot. Could you just point that out on the map and explain where it is?

Engineer Bohler – Sure. So, all the parking spaces that are requested in the variance are the ones along the east side of the property; parking spaces right here. So, the 56-foot area is this last parking space here. At this location, this parking space is about seven feet below grade

Member Pryor – So, it’s, so that’s your worst spot.

Engineer Bohler – and then as the road kind of goes parallel with the building, it becomes equalized and at this point it’s about 15 feet below grade and there’s also evergreen trees starting at six and seven feet high in front of that so in addition to being below grade, there’s also the trees that

Member Pryor – So, it’s not the whole width of the building; it’s basically where you had your pencil there; there corner.

Engineer Bohler – Well, uh, the worst-case scenario is probably ten parking spaces along Strykers or that most intrusive into that setback.

Member Weeks – And there’s seven feet below grade?

Engineer Bohler – At a minimum and they get deeper and on top of the landscape area which is higher, we have six-foot trees and shrubs as well.

Mayor Mengucci – The fire apparatus you’re talked about running, around that property

Engineer Bohler – Yes.

Mayor Mengucci – Are we including the ladder truck.

Engineer Bohler – Yes, we got the largest truck from the department.

Mayor Mengucci – Okay.

Chairman VanVliet – The Fire Department is in agreement with what you're considering?

Engineer Bohler – We showed them our truck turning. We haven't seen .. we did show before we filed the application, our truck turning, our Utility Plan to show the hydrants specifically asked for by the Fire Department as well.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay but they had no objection to it at that point?

Engineer Bohler – Correct.

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you.

Member Weeks – I got a question. The one concern I have is if you're looking at Strykers Road coming the way your bend is, where your parking lot was, well let's look at Strykers Road where your lower output is, all right, that bend, when it snow storms is a pretty nasty bend, okay, accident wise. The distance you have there is that going to give you a problem with the people coming down and the trucker being in the middle of the road?

Engineer Bohler – (Inaudible) distance?

Member Weeks – Yes, I know there's a certain amount there but when they come around the corner, they lose it on that corner at times.

Engineer Bohler – Sure, some of the reason they might be losing it is cause the grade at that turn is kind of mounded up a little bit. We're taking that down so going from the curb line we're not going to come down, so it allows for some visibility. Our site distance is designed so that it actually accounts for the grade based on AASHTO as well as a truck and a car so we look at both scenarios with Maser so they reviewed it as well how they accounted for the steeper grade. As you have steeper grade there is a little bit longer stopping like this as you need so we accounted for that as well.

Member Weeks – Did you account for signage; like trucks entering road or anything in that fashion being put there?

Engineer Bohler – No, we did not feel it was necessary but if the Board feels it is necessary to add an entering sign, we could certainly do that.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Now, do I understand on that same driveway, that's a right turn only exit, right?

Engineer Bohler – That's correct.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – So, conceivably, the way the trucks, regardless of which way they come, whether they come from 519 or they come from 57, they're going to enter on the upper north end, right?

Engineer Bohler – Generally, yes.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Enter there, go around to the loading dock and then come out and have to go back to 519.

Engineer Bohler – That's correct.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Right, they'll have no other choice but to do that.

Engineer Bohler – That's correct.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Which would actually push them back onto 22.

Engineer Bohler – Yes.

Vice – Chairman Fischbach – Unless they can't go through (inaudible) there're probably not going to be able to get through the culvert.

Engineer Bohler – No.

Mayor Mengucci – More than likely.

Member Weeks – Nor through

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – So, right, they could come up 57 and then or they can come up 519 and then but they can't exit and go back out to 57?

Engineer Bohler – Yeah, and it depends on users as well. Some users may not have a lot of truck turnover so they might use the southern driveway to enter and then exit as well so it's always going to be folks coming off northern but

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Yeah okay, I gotcha.

Chairman VanVliet – You can't enter that lower driveway though, but you cannot make a left turn coming out of that driveway.

Engineer Bohler – Correct, so I'll just reiterate trucks for the northern driveway can go in only; left and right, on the southern driveway, trucks can go in both right and left and only go out right.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – And the other thing is you mentioned spots; did you say 489?

Engineer Bohler – Four hundred eight-seven.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Okay, that's what I have. I just wanted to make sure; I thought I heard wrong.

Engineer Bohler – I did say that first and then I corrected

Member Pryor – You did, I wrote it down.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Okay, that's uh, I was just checking.

Chairman VanVliet - You mentioned you go from 10,000 square feet for office space to possibly 20,000 square feet of office space.

Engineer Bohler – Yes.

Chairman VanVliet – That'll fit the balance of parking spaces required at that point, would you be coming back for any additional parking spots if that occurs.

Engineer Bohler – So, the way that the ordinance reads, it's 1 ½ spaces per employee or based on square footage, you can use either one of them. In our scenario, we accounted for employees within office spaces as well as within the warehouse and we think it's accurate for what we have currently proposed. So, if the office space got bigger, there might be a different fluctuation in the number of employees but not a significant amount where there be a variance created; we have some buffer there.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay, thank you,

Member Pryor – I don't know if this is your testimony; how many employees are you anticipating?

Engineer Bohler – Three hundred on maximum shift.

Member Pryor – Three hundred per shift.

Engineer Bohler – Maximum shift; that's sometimes the different shifts are less than

Member Pryor - And are you going to operate three shifts?

Engineer Bohler – I don't know

Talking over each other.

Member Pryor – (Inaudible).

Engineer Bohler - I'll testify to that.

Member Weeks – Can you tell me where you're draining into other Lopatcong Creek?

Engineer Bohler – Sure, so, I'll use my hand so it's not the best thing for the record but JCP&L easement runs north/south on this plan so, kind of parallel with the western property line, not the Rt. 22 side, at (inaudible) to the southeast, I'm sorry the northeast of that location of the discharge point directly outside of that easement

Member Weeks – There is a discharge all right, for the town

Engineer Bohler – Yes. So that discharge is regulated by the DEP, the Highlands; there is a trout restoration program that was done here, they reviewed it as well, so everyone's bought on off on that at that location.

Member Weeks – Okay.

Member Coyle – So when you talk about three shifts, you're talking about the office.

Engineer Bohler – It'll be the warehouse itself, if there is three shifts, I don't, I can't testify that whether or not there're going to have three shifts or not.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – So, to that point, what type of warehouse would this be because there's three types of warehouses, am I correct? Right, there's one that just brings in goods and ships out goods. There's other ones that bring in goods, that do some assembly; put them in and crate them up and then ship them out and then there's ones that do more assembly. We've been taught on this one from the Ingersoll Rand property so there's three types of warehouses. Do we know which type of warehouse this is?

Engineer Bohler – Not right now.

Attorney Peck – We haven't identified tenants.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Okay.

Member Pryor – You would though, would you not classify this as a high-cube warehouse based on the square footage and the height.

Chairman VanVliet – Thought the Board usually doesn't get into it, but you mentioned the sanitary sewer extension line with a pump station.

Engineer Bohler – Yes.

Chairman VanVliet – Is it being proposed to just service this area, or would it be available to service other tenants along the Strykers Road area?

Engineer Bohler – It's a great question.

Chairman VanVliet – Is it sized for that or not?

Engineer Bohler – So, when we designed it, one of the requests and worked with Maser was for us to design it for our site, so it functioned appropriately with DEP criteria, we also looked at the rest of the zone along Strykers Road, we took out Berry's Plastic because they have their own system already,

Chairman VanVliet – Correct.

Engineer Bohler - so, we didn't include them, but we basically went up Strykers Road on the west side and tried to maximize our density based on what is permitted there currently. We also went across the street behind Berry's Plastic; there's a lot there that's landlocked right now as



well as the solar field, we included the solar field just in case you never know and use those as calculations so there's a maximum flow that would actually be able to go to the pump station

Chairman VanVliet -Right.

Engineer Bohler – Where or not that happens in the future, who knows, but it sized to allow for those flows to come in if they ever

Chairman VanVliet – Hook in.

Engineer Bohler -are generated.

Chairman VanVliet – I appreciate that.

Member Pryor – Well, I'm just looking, the pump station as sized if to serve you alone would be relatively small; how many GPM are we talking about? Do you know?

Engineer Bohler – I don't remember off the top of my head, sorry.

Member Pryor – Yeah, okay.

Engineer Bohler – But you're right. It, it

Member Pryor – It's relatively small so we're not talking about, you know, major upgrade. We're talking about something very small, something

Engineer Bohler – Yeah so the

Member Pryor – bigger, but not,

Engineer Bohler – when you go

Member Pryor – not huge.

Engineer Bohler – when we're at a full build out we're adding a third pump and a little bit bigger wet well so with a little more storage. As of right not, but you're right, the current design is a very small user; it's 12,000 gallons a day.

Member Pryor – Yeah, would you have to upgrade the force main at all?

Engineer Bohler – No, the size has been designed for cleaning velocity for the smallest to the largest.

Member Pryor – Okay.

Member Weeks – And your detention ponds made to hold how much water per flow?

Engineer Bohler – The hundred-year storm event and provide reductions, so, that it meets DEP criteria and account for the (inaudible) conditions conditions conversation but that would be it meets DEP criteria.

Chairman VanVliet – The, most of the utilities coming down the plant will be in Strykers Road itself, or is it going out try to be located outside the road?

Engineer Bohler – As of right now the gas would be in the shoulder on the west side. That's where it ends currently; electric would be overhead.

Chairman VanVliet – Right.

Engineer Bohler – Water is on the east side unfortunately on Strykers Road and sanitary would be on the west side for DEP criteria. So, we do have cut in the road as part of that.

Chairman VanVliet – And you're going to be working on your lower intersection or driveway area there and you're going to try to flatten out the grade there; the hump there?

Engineer Bohler – So, yeah, my testimony was that current grading in the grass area kind of builds itself up so it's hard to see around the bend where our intent is taking the curb line and cutting it down so you can see around the bend more appropriately.

Chairman VanVliet – I'm looking at a little bit of the selfish thing for the Township here but if all the utilities and it's going to be requiring tearing up Strykers Road, would you be amenable to do a whole paving on Strykers Road as opposed to just doing half or a utility trench or

Engineer Bohler – I think the answer is yes, however, we'd like to maybe work in the field with Maser. If the answer is our contractors didn't do a great job, I think the answer would be yes. If they do a great, job and they can seam it up appropriately and there's not a major issue, then maybe Maser can work with us to kind of waiver from that requirement. I'm not expecting to leave the road in bad condition but some of the (inaudible) can be used that are out there do a great job and it doesn't seem like there is a saw cut in the road, so.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay.

Member Pryor – Yeah, the road is showing wear though and, you know, even with a good trench repair and overlay, you know, it's something to be considered, so, we'll talk about it down the road, all right.

Attorney Bryce- And don't forget you do have the option to ask them to enter into a developer's agreement with the municipality; we'll address that.

Member Pryor – I know you can't commit to a major road reconstruction, you can't, I don't even know if the client can at this point though.

Attorney Peck – It's a big variable.

Member Pryor – It will be a point of discussion going down the road.

Attorney Peck – Does the Board have any further questions for the witness?

Member Weeks – I have. Berry Plastics right next, not Berry Plastics, Precast right next to it, how far are we away from that; how does that affect it and we made the buffer

Engineer Bohler – The buffer is there.

Member Weeks – And how does that affect their driveway?

Engineer Bohler – Buffer's there. Their driveway site distances will not be affected by our buffer; our driveway is end of radius; end of radius is 1300 feet away.

Member Weeks – All right.

Chairman VanVliet – Board done; I'll open it up to the public for questions of this gentleman from an engineering standpoint, yes sir. Will you identify yourself?

Douglas Batchelder – I'm Douglas Batchelder. I live in Lopatcong Township on Jade Lane. I'm a resident of the Township for about 40 years. I have a concern that was expressed earlier by Mr. Weeks of this section of roadway here especially with so much truck traffic ingressing and egressing at that point. As Mr. Pryor just pointed out, this section of road is presently showing considerable wear. I, myself, had slipped driving that in the wintertime in the conditions where there's been rain but then froze in the road. I consider this a very hazardous location to have slow moving vehicles ingressing and egressing. That traffic issue I think is my significant concern at both ends of Strykers. Come out to Rt. 57 where there is a railroad track, you come

out to 519 which is a lousy intersection. With present traffic recently, just as recently as last week I was traveling this direction on Strykers and the traffic was backed up from the light all the way here. I can't imagine 400 vehicles, cars, plus tractor-trailer rigs on Strykers Road given the present condition in use. What can be done to elevate that?

Member Pryor – We're going to hear traffic testimony in a bit, and we'll revisit that all right?

Douglas Batchelder- Thank you.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay, anyone else? All right, I'll close this public portion and the questioning. Thank you.

Attorney Peck - Thanks Brad. I'd like to call the next witness John Wichner.

Attorney Bryce – Thank you. Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

John Wichner – I do.

Attorney Bryce – Okay just state your name for the record.

John Wichner – Yes. John Wichner – W-i-c-h-n-e-r.

Attorney Peck – Thanks John. Would you give the Board the benefit of your educational/professional background?

John Wichner – Yes. I'm employed by McMahon Associates. I have a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from Pennsylvania State University. I have a Master of Science in Transportation Engineering from Villanova University. I am a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey as well as three other states and I've been practicing engineering for approximately 20 years.

Attorney Peck – Focusing on traffic engineering?

John Wichner – Solely on traffic and transportation engineering.

Attorney Peck – And have you been accepted as an expert in New Jersey by courts or land use boards.

John Wichner – Yes, I have.

Attorney Peck – Very good and you are familiar with this project?

John Wichner – Yes, I am.

Attorney Peck – I'd like to move Mr. Wichner as an expert in the field of traffic engineering.

Chairman VanVliet – He's acceptable.

Attorney Peck – Very good. John, why don't you tell the Board about what you've observed and what's included.

John Wichner – Sure. So, going back about six or seven months ago, we started meeting with both Township staff as well as County staff regarding this project and in fact, I think it was late June when we sat down with Maser's office to discuss intersections that we would be studying around the surrounding area. We also met with the County as early as July of this year and then as recently, in November as well, so, working with both the Township and the County for studying certain intersections, if I can bring up the previous exhibit, I believe this is A-1, we obviously, you know, in preparing our traffic impact study we'd take a look at the two driveway locations that were shown on the previous exhibit, we went up to Rt. 57 and Strykers Road to the north we also took a look at Strykers Road and 519 to the south and then 519 to 22 and really the proximity of this site to Rt. 22 is, it really lends itself to the traffic pattern of to and from Rt. 22 to the site. As with any traffic impact study we start existing counts, existing traffic counts at all these different intersection during the morning rush hour and the afternoon rush hour we take a look at future, no-build conditions adding growth factors and traffic from nearby development center that are anticipated to be developed in future years and that allows us to then utilize that future no-build condition as a base line. After that, we apply traffic and trips generated by this development during the morning and afternoon peak hours to those no-build conditions that allows us to then compare it to future build conditions and that's where we start to get the comparison to determine mitigation techniques. From a trip generation perspective, one of the questions I know that Maser, Maser had was regarding trips and since no tenant has been identified, we utilized the Institute of Transportation Engineers Land Use Code 150 which is general warehouse. There was a question earlier tonight about warehouse versus high-cube warehouse, what we've seen is that high-cube warehouse is highly automated which, which, you know, the higher the automation the lower the employee counts and so that's why we chose to use a general warehouse land use code for our trip, our trip generation. Our independent variable was utilizing square footage for, for the building at 511,000 square feet. Ultimately, that's the proposal; no Township really approves tenants, they approve their, their, they approve square footages independent variable. In terms of parking spaces and things of that nature and employee shifts, the team utilized an employee shift number of approximately 300 that is really to kind of keep a wider perspective tenant pool in case a tenant is out there in the market that

would want to utilize that type of parking, that type of sewer allocation, things of that nature. We then take a look at, again, going back to the comparison of base line of the no-build conditions to the future build conditions, we identified a couple of different improvements that, that we are coordinating with the County on and ultimately will be coordinating with NJDOT on. Starting up, starting at 22 and 519 and unfortunately that's off the page of exhibit A-1 we all know the intersection from a geometric standpoint. There is not much we can do, in fact, I think the County I believe or NJDOT has a masterplan of really great separate interchange at that location. That's really the next step of the evolution of that intersection but that's not to say we can't, or we shouldn't look at optimizing the signal times of the intersection. Every couple years or so, sometimes timings get out of whack with a change in traffic patterns so that was one item that we identified in the traffic study. At the intersection of Strykers Road and 519, there are, during some of the peak hours, they southbound movement on Strykers Road trying to enter onto 519 does have some delays. The, really the mitigation technique at that intersection is the installation of a traffic signal and there's currently a traffic signal at 519 and Dumont. What we've done in the past is, is if a signal were to be installed in that proximity, we'd model it as a clustered signal and really the two signals are operating off of the same controller. It's much like an offset intersection or kind of a job movement there. We are working with the County; in fact, we have a meeting set up for Monday, actually probably the third meeting that we had with the County to talk about their desires at that intersection. About six month ago, they said that they weren't really interested in a traffic signal and just recently in November they then said that they did want a traffic signal so, you know, they're reviewing, they're currently reviewing the latest information that, you know, Maser just reviewed it at their, the County is a little bit of a step behind Maser's office in their review but we'll be talking with them on Monday but we anticipate that being the most appropriate, the most appropriate improvement at that intersection. There is already a left turn lane from 519 onto Strykers and then really the alignment of Strykers was, that was kind of realigned, you know, by the County to kind of bring more of a 90-degree angle there. There's one other question in Maser's review letter and that was really dealing with oh and I apologize, the (inaudible) section, Strykers Road and Rt. 57 that is another intersection where we identify traffic signal retiming, that was identified with the plan that Maser had reviewed which and Mr. Bohler kind of testified to some recent driveway changes specifically at the northern driveway, our traffic study analyzed the northern driveway allowing trucks to make a left here up toward 57; that's the study that Maser reviewed. Since their subsequent review letter, our team has been coordinating with Maser to restrict all exiting trucks at this driveway so, we identified some signal retiming up there, I think it may still be a good idea to, to, to take a look at the authorization of that intersection but now we (inaudible) traffic up there under the new driveway configuration of trucks exiting this driveway so one of the questions of Maser's review letter was with our proposed signal retiming, does that mean we need to kind of go down the Rt. 57 corridor to other signalized intersections and NJDOT has a has really as a standard where you start to retime one intersection if they're part of a coordinated signal you have to take a look at the rest of the system. The closest signalized intersection to 57 and Strykers is I believe

it's um over 4000 feet away so it's really not in a coordinated system so it really acts as an isolated intersection but I think we're actually going to be under that seven second threshold where, you know, that, that Maser had commented on now with their driveway re-configuration so I think we're, you know, we're still looking at optimizing the intersection. I think we're only at that seven second threshold there, but again, you know, working with the County specifically at 519 and Strykers and then working with NJDOT at the other offset intersections that I mentioned.

Chairman VanVliet – Most of the truck traffic that will be exiting from Strykers Road onto 519 will be consist of right-hand truck turns only. I don't think you're going to see a lot of left hand turns there since they can't get under the tunnel, they'll go over to

John Wichner – That's correct and the fact that the County asked us, right now there's some signage on 519 about the clearance; I think it's a ten-foot clearance there. It's about a mile to the north. The County has asked us to kind of beef up that signage cause what they don't want to do, is they don't want anyone making a left off Strykers and all of a sudden where do you turn around so, we were asked to put some signage on Strykers Road before they get to the intersection in this location and then once they get to the intersection, it's a "T" intersection, so, opposite that intersection, they would have additional signage really to prevent them from making a left. Can't do it physically, but through

Chairman VanVliet – But you can

John Wichner – those two locations, we want to prevent that.

Chairman VanVliet – At least advise the driver don't make a left turn.

John Wichner – Correct. I don't think uh, we don't want that anymore than they do, then they do, so, that's something the County asked us to do and we're going to comply with that.

Member Pryor – I have a series of questions. Would it be appropriate? I'll start as I remember them. What was your name again, sir?

John Wichner – John, John Wichner.

Member Pryor – John, I read the County's letter and they had concerns about when the traffic counts were taken. Does your updated report have new counts in it?

John Wichner – Yes, everything that is in Maser's possession has the new updated traffic counts.

Member Pryor – Okay and I’m just going to build on that a little bit. We have an asphalt plant that’s going to generate quite a bit of traffic; it’s been approved but it’s not operating yet, is that in there?

John Wichner – The County actually actually asked us to include a number of different approved, but not yet, operating I guess developments and I’m going to get my list here is you bear with me.

Member Pryor – Okay. I’m just trying to make sure we got everything in there that belongs in there.

John Wichner – Correct. There are actually three nearby developments and I apologize here.

Member Pryor – The asphalt plants probably going to be the big one; I’m mean that’s going to be running trucks a lot.

John Wichner – Right, so, it’s Intercounty Paving.

Chairman VanVliet -That’s been changed.

John Wichner – Right.

Member Pryor – That’s in there yeah.

John Wichner – Yes, Intercounty Paving. The Berry Plastics expansion and the K&S Enterprises.

Member Pryor – Is K&S the one on the corner there?

Talking over each other

Member Pryor – There building another warehouse, right?

John Wichner – So, we collected information from both Maser’s office as well as the County office. We collector their traffic impact studies; there’s three and then we put them in our notebook, we put them in our notebook conditions for future conditions.

Member Pryor – Yeah and Mr. Batchelder brought up the; is it Reverend?

Reverend Batchelder – Yes, sir.



Member Pryor – Reverend Batchelder, he brought up the intersection of 519 and Strykers. I know you have done accident counts; it looks like fair amount of accidents for an intersection like that. That’s even where, I drive it every day. I’m not traffic engineer.

John Wichner – Right.

Member Pryor – I do think the idea of a coordinated signal there makes an awful lot of sense. That was originally proposed as a four-way intersection; there was some objections and it got reconfigured differently but I’ve been there when car edges up and then the other one, they just built the library, there’s another left-hand turn for the library people coming down; they get confused. Now we are going to be adding trucks from both the asphalt plant, this facility, I can’t imagine that functioning well without improvements, so, I’ll just throw that out there. I know your accident data cut off, I guess, in 2018; we had some humdingers out on Strykers and 57 this year. One truck hit a train. Was there a fatality on there with that? I know there’s another one up

Chairman VanVliet – I don’t believe so, no.

Member Pryor – but a couple bad accidents this year so

Chairman VanVliet – I think she survived that.

Member Pryor – I drive that, and since I retired, I don’t drive it as much, but I used to drive it every day. I’ve seen one truck make it through a cycle of that signal there; one truck

John Wichner – I’m sorry, at 57 and Strykers?

Member Pryor – Yes. So, I just bring these up; I know that you have work to do yet with the State, you have work to do with the County; I’m just kind of bringing these things up coming out at the turn there I don’t know if we can look at speed limits. What is the speed limit?

Mayor Mengucci – Forty, I think.

John Wichner – It’s 40 MPH.

Member Pryor – Maybe that should be looked at.

Mayor Mengucci – The other thing that I would be concerned with too on that road and I could be wrong, but those coming off of Exit 3, off of 78 who maybe do work down the line, who live in our Meadowview section and our Country Hills section, our Blakeley Park section, Warren

Height, I would think they're going to come down there and they're going to go across Strykers so there's a heck of a line there probably around five o'clock was there any sort of study done there?

John Wichner – Well, we took a look of the hours of four, I'm sorry, seven to nine in the morning; four to six in the afternoon so kind of captures