

WEST WINDSOR TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 6, 2019

The regular meeting of the Planning Board was called to order at 7:04 pm on Wednesday, February 6, 2019 by Chair O'Brien in Meeting Room A of the Municipal Building.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Pursuant to the Sunshine Law, a notice of this meeting's date, time, location and agenda was mailed to the news media, posted on the township bulletin board and filed with the municipal clerk on January 31, 2019.

ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Sue Appelget
Linda Geever
Curtis Hoberman
Michael Huey
Andrea Mandel
Hemant Marathe
Simon Pankove
Anis Baig-Alt II
Michael Karp
Gene O'Brien

There were no public comments on non-agenda items.

Mr. Surtees reviewed the meeting schedule. The township Planning Board and Council will meet on February 27, 2019 to adopt and endorse, respectively, the Housing Element & Fair Share Plan and amend the Land Use Element. Once the HE&FSP is adopted, there are eleven ordinances that the council will have to introduce at a future meeting. The Planning Board will review the ordinances on March 13, 2019.

Mr. Huey said that he will be absent on February 27, 2019.

Cherry Grove major subdivision application is tentatively scheduled for April 24, 2019.

The MLUL is extended until April 24, 2019.

Ms. Kristin Appelget, from Princeton University, advised Mr. Surtees that the April 10, 2019 date that the concept plan was to be heard by the board may have to be moved to May 1, 2019.

November 7, 2018 minutes:

Page 2, third paragraph under "Applications", "residence" should be "residences".
Page 4, sixth paragraph from the bottom, "existing" should be corrected to "exiting".

Motion made by Mr. Pankove to approve the November 7, 2018 minutes with two minor spelling changes.
Seconded by Ms. Mandel. Voice vote, motion approved.

RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution 2019-R04 PB17-07 Douglas & Rose Massias

Counsel Muller explained that the Massias' have received minor subdivision approval. Under MLUL, they had until May 10, 2018 to file a plan for deeds to perfect the subdivision. They were trying to work with NJDEP to swap

conservation lands and wetlands. They wanted to do this simultaneously with filing the deeds, but there was a delay. The Board granted an extension running from January 2, 2019 for a sixty-day period.

Ms. Geever is marked as absent from this meeting. She said that she was not at the meeting because her term had expired as a member of the Planning Board, and Council did not reorganize until the following week. Counsel Muller will make that change.

Ms. Geever also pointed out a typo in the last line of the resolution; "sixty day" should be "sixty days".

In the first line, Ms. Appelget pointed out that "07" is missing from the application number.

Mr. Hoberman made a motion to adopt resolution 2019-R04 with changes. Seconded by Mayor Marathe. Motion approved 5-0 by roll call vote. Mr. Baig abstained.

APPLICATION:

PB18-11 - Carnegie Center East-Bldg. 408 Interim Parking Lot

Kevin Moore from Sills, Cummis & Gross represents Boston Properties L.P. He explained that the applicant seeks three approvals from the Board, which will be discussed by Mr. Thomas.

Four witnesses were sworn in. Michael Thomas, PE, T & M Associates; Bruce Klein, Traffic Engineer, T & M Associates; Gregory Ricciardi, representative from Boston Properties; and Jeffrey Cucinotta, PP, AICP, T & M Associates.

Mr. Thomas presented Exhibit A1, an overview of the interim parking lot project that is being proposed and the surrounding existing and proposed buildings. The applicant is seeking final site plan approval for a 271 space interim parking lot on the property known as Block 9, Lot 84; 408 Carnegie Center Drive. It is approximately 6.887 acres in size and is to be used as supplemental parking for Building 508.

The 400 series of buildings, located in the center of Carnegie Center East adjacent to where the parking lot is located, are not constructed yet. Buildings 204 and 208 are planned, but not constructed.

Applicant is also requesting a 20-year extension to prior Preliminary B site plan approval, which included several buildings in Carnegie Center East.

In addition, there is the Carnegie Center guidelines that were brought up to date with a modern approach and designed for the west side as well.

Mr. Huey raised concern that the report is unreadable because of the lack of spacing between the words in this report.

Chair O'Brien said it is not clear to the Board what changes are being made to the document and what the Board is being asked to approve. He asked the Board members to forward comments to Mr. Surtees, who will relay them to Mr. Moore.

Mr. Moore agreed to defer the approval of the guidelines.

Proceeding with the application on the parking lot, Chair O'Brien asked why it is necessary to build supplemental parking for an existing building. Since they are not adjacent to each other he is concerned about the safety of

pedestrians moving from the parking lot to the building. Also, when Building 408 is constructed, these spaces will be needed for that building, so what is the future parking plan for those that work in Building 508.

Mr. Ricciardi explained that Otsuka is the only tenant in Building 508. From time to time they have independent contractors come to the site. Currently, they use the parking for Building 506. Additional tenants will be moving into Building 506, so that parking will no longer be available to employees of Otsuka.

As for safety concerns, the 408 proposed lot and Building 508 are pretty close together. The path to the building is a paved straight, non-sloping path with some covered areas and is frequently used. All buildings have pathway lighting. Pedestrian crosswalks are defined. It is up to Otsuka to allocate space to those with special needs.

Mr. Ricciardi went on to explain that the applicant is asking for a 20-year extension on the campus approval and Building 408 will likely be the last to be built. There is no way to know what the situation will be at the point when 408 is built, and parking will be taken away from Otsuka; so this is the best solution at this time.

Mayor Marathe asked if parking permits will be issued. Mr. Ricciardi replied that there is no need or desire for other tenants to use this interim parking.

Mr. Kochenour was sworn in. He said that some of the information he reviewed made reference to 150 spaces currently being provided to Otsuka in the parking deck of Building 506. Testimony supports all 271 spaces being proposed in the interim lot will be used by Otsuka. He is asking for clarification of how many spaces for use on this site.

Mr. Ricciardi said that they anticipate Otsuka using 150 spaces. Ultimately the lot is being built to serve Building 408 in the future, so the design is to build the entire lot out, with 271 spaces, at one time.

Mr. Thomas presented Exhibit A2, Pedestrian Circulation. There are multiple entrances into Building 508. However, the front and back are the most utilized. There are two paths for pedestrian usage, one going to the front and one to the back. These paths are less than a quarter mile long. It takes approximately five minutes to walk from the lot to the building.

Mr. Hoberman commented that, if he parked at the north end of the interim lot, he would not want to walk south to cross the road to walk north to get to the building.

Mr. Ricciardi explained that one of the applications, not submitted to the Planning Board, is under administrative review. Mr. Kochenour and the Engineering Department also reviewed the application. A road diet and signage package is being done in Carnegie Center. Essentially all of the signs at Carnegie Center will be replaced with more up to date signs, which include traffic control signs. Suggestions were made about pedestrian crossings and bicycle usage. There will be five or six strategically located pedestrian crossing areas with beacons. One of the crossings is located along South Transverse Road, which goes from where Building 408 would be located, to the other side. The location for this crosswalk compliments exactly the intent of the Master Plan in that the path on the southerly end accommodates bicyclists and pedestrians. A pedestrian beacon will be at the specific location of where we want people to cross. The applicant would be open to considering a more direct crossing path. Mr. Ricciardi added that the speed limit is 25 miles per hour.

In response to Ms. Mandel's question about the beacons, Mr. Ricciardi said there is one on each side of South Transverse Road. There are several other points around Carnegie Center where beacons will be installed.

Mr. Huey asked about the maintenance and safety of the parking lot. Boston Properties will maintain the parking lot. The areas are highly populated and roving security will be present around the entire campus.

Mr. Thomas presented Exhibit A3, a colorized rendering of the lot. It includes the landscaping and under-ground utilities that are proposed for the interim lot. The lot is consistent with the approved Master Plan and the full build out of Building 408 in the future. The lot was not changed from a geometric point of view.

The major difference is that right now only standardized parking spaces, 9 x 18 feet, are being proposed. The code permits compact car spaces, up to 30 percent for the entire project. When Building 408 is built, there will be a series of spaces around the south and west perimeter of the lot that will be converted from standard spaces to compact spaces. The intent is to meet the parking requirement of about 330 spaces when the building is built out.

Chair O'Brien feels that it would be fairer to disperse compact spaces throughout the parking lot, rather than just around the perimeter.

Mr. Thomas said there is another location on the northern end that will be converted for compact spaces. When Building 408 is built, handicapped and commuter parking will also be introduced.

Storm water management will be collected from two systems that are on site. Consistent with NJDEP regulations and township code, approximately 193 of the spaces being proposed will be porous pavement. Porous pavement serves as a filtration system and improves water quality by trapping particulates that come out of cars. Porous pavement also contains storm water on site. When water hits porous pavement, it drives through and is stored in a sub-surface collection system.

The other storm water management system is intended to be an extended detention facility. The purpose is to deal with the increase in rainfall runoff that has occurred from the 1980's until now. There is an existing 27 to 30-inch pipe connecting all the way down along South Transverse Road in an eastbound direction. The pipe eventually ties into basins four, five and six, which were designed in the Master Plan in the 1980's.

NJDEP also requires ground water recharge. However, a geotechnical engineer tested the property and found that the soils were not permeable, so it is not conducive toward ground water recharge. This is consistent with Appendix E of the NJDEP Storm Water Management Manual.

Mr. Huey finds it interesting that porous pavement is found to be superior to a water drain.

Mr. Thomas explained that porous pavement has a two-part system and there is a sub-surface pipe that takes storm water from underneath into a collection system. Porous pavement is a little more expensive because you have to install sub-surface gravel and there is a larger box that is underneath. However, it takes away the need to build an unnecessarily large above-ground retention basin.

Ms. Mandel asked about the pitch of the porous pavement around the circumference of the lot. Mr. Thomas explained that the way the lot is graded it is designed to capture storm water that is draining in a northwest to southeast direction. While it does not capture everything, remaining storm water that does not get captured from these systems does eventually get drained and collected into the extended detention basin that is being proposed on the southeastern corner of the property.

There is an existing swale, located on the north of the lot that has wetlands associated with it. The lot will stay out of the wetlands. When Building 408 is built, the wetlands will be mitigated.

Mr. Hoberman asked why some of the parking spots do not have porous pavement. These spots are high points on the site so the water will not be going in that direction.

Ms. Mandel asked if there is a plan to put car-charging stations in the lot while it is being built. Boston Properties is taking some initiative to put stations around the east side, as well as other strategic locations where EV charging stations are being proposed around the site. There are already EV charging spaces allocated to Building 508 that are already installed and being used by Carnegie Center tenants only. ADA rules require that handicapped spaces have to be as close as possible to the front entrance of a building. A few of the spaces in front of the Building 508 lot are being restriped for handicapped spaces. There is an EV charging station at the handicapped spaces.

Ms. Mandel asked about bicycle parking in the new lot and thought it made more sense to be able to park bikes closer to the 508 building.

Mr. Thomas explained that the ring road that goes around Carnegie Center is Carnegie Center Drive. Carnegie Center Drive is currently two lanes in each direction. The road diet plan takes these two lanes, makes it one lane in each direction, with a turning lane in the middle and bike lanes on either side.

The proposed bike spaces are strategically located on the eastern portion of the lot. The applicant does agree to increase the bike spaces to 14 spaces.

In the rear of Building 506, there is a courtyard that leads out to a green area located in the center of the 500 series buildings. There is a bike share program being implemented for use by the general public and Carnegie Center employees. South Transverse Road, which bisects Carnegie Center Drive, is not wide enough to accommodate bike lanes, but bicyclist can still share the road.

Mr. Ricciardi added that there are the same number of employees and those that currently ride bikes and park at Building 506 will be able to park along the 500 series. The applicant is not opposed to adding additional bike parking at Building 508 if needed.

It was also noted that bike parking is not covered.

Mr. Thomas discussed the lighting levels on the walking paths around the 408 Lot. Pedestrian specific lights are not being provided in the lot, but there is sufficient lighting on the southern portion of the lot where the sidewalk connects the 408 Lot to the 500 series buildings.

Mr. Guzik asked about lighting at the crosswalk location. Mr. Thomas said that the beacon is the only lighted fixture at the crosswalk. The lighting levels being provided at the intersection associated with the driveway do meet the township code requirement. To the immediate area to the north and south, including the pedestrian crosswalk, there should be sufficient lighting to cross.

Mr. Thomas responded to Ms. Appelget's question about the sidewalk. He said they are proposing to terminate the sidewalk near Building 406 and 404. There will be no additional lighting provided on South Transverse Road and Carnegie Drive.

Mr. Hoberman questioned the drawing on Sheet 5, showing a sidewalk that leads to South Transverse Road and Carnegie Center. If there is a sidewalk, there should be a pedestrian crosswalk to provide an alternate route to Building 508 for users parking at the northern end.

Chair O'Brien suggested that the applicant work with Mr. Kochenour to come up with a workable solution at this location.

Ms. Mandel asked about access into the parking lot. She is concerned that anyone can enter at dangerous points. There are two locations on the southerly entrance with connection points to the sidewalk. People will be directed to these entry points. Areas other than the entrance points will be landscaped with a mix of bushes, trees and plants, making it difficult to enter from these areas.

Mr. Thomas presented the "Turning Exhibit for a Passenger Vehicle" to address Mr. Kochenour's concern with the angle of the turn on the westerly corner of the lot. It shows that passenger cars can turn within the areas. The dimension of a "passenger" vehicle is based on an average passenger sedan. He said that changing the radii will result in a loss of spaces, which could present a problem when Building 408 is built out. Mr. Thomas will work with Mr. Kochenour to come up with a solution to reduce the angle of the turn.

Emergency vehicles, such as fire trucks, can make turning movements around the lot within two aisles of every car space.

Mr. Thomas said that he spoke to Mr. Yates concerning the installation of fire hydrants in the parking lot. Mr. Yates was not concerned with fire hydrants being installed until the building is built, at which time the hydrants should be strategically located in the lot. If there were a car fire, the water comes from the truck. The applicant will install the lateral piping for future fire mains in the interim lot, but will not install the hydrants until the building is built.

Van commuter space will be provided when Building 408 is built.

Ms. Geevers brought up putting in conduits for charging stations. Mr. Thomas said there are designated charging stations throughout the campus. They are added close to the buildings for handicap accessibility and electrical conduits for those types of systems are generally located close to the buildings. At this time it is not feasible to add charging stations to Building 408 since it is 20 years in the future and technology could be different then.

Mr. Thomas recited several design waivers that have to do with construction of the building. Since no building is being proposed at this time, they do not apply.

Mr. Guzik requested the metes and bounds description be provided around the wetland area. The applicant will provide this.

Applicant is proposing a future condition that handicapped spaces be 18 feet long instead of 20 feet long when Building 408 is built out. Eighteen (18) feet is consistent with the rest of the spaces and aisle width. The spaces on the Building 508 side are 20 foot.

Chair O'Brien pointed out a couple of things on the Site Plan Checklist. There is no check mark or "W.R." on page 4, Item 6. Applicant said this will be waived and "W.R." will be added on page 4. This item will also be added to the last page.

Page 5, Item (4), no line is provided. "W.R." will be added.

Ms. Appelget asked if there is a parking shortfall for any of the buildings. She was advised that there is no parking shortfall. The applicant will explore methods to ensure that employees park in the proper lots.

Mr. Pankove asked how the construction phase will impact current employees and other businesses. Construction is self-contained at the end of Carnegie Center Campus so it is unlikely that it will disturb anyone other than Boston Property tenants. There are construction standards, as well as security and safety procedures, in place for the walking path.

Currently the parcel is farmland assessment and will come out of farmland assessment. NJ Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Standards require locations be shown where excavated soils will be temporarily stockpiled.

Mr. Klein talked about how traffic is going to be moved around the site. There are two access points along the southwestern portion of the tract to the Building 506 parking structure, currently being used by Otsuka. Vehicles come in from all different directions. There will be a little shifting in traffic and movement internally.

Most of the cars will be moving over to South Transverse Road, so instead of coming off Meadow Road and making a left to go to this parking lot, they will continue from Carnegie Center Drive onto South Transverse Road.

Externally, there is no change other than cars coming northbound off of Route 1. They will not come in off the ramp, but will go to Carnegie Center Boulevard and then work their way from there.

During peak times there will be more change in traffic, but arrival and departure times are dispersed over a several hour period.

Chair O'Brien commented that there is an exit lane coming northbound on Route 1 to make a right turn to Carnegie Center Boulevard so there would not be a lot of stacking.

Mr. Ricciardi said they will work with Otsuka to assign spaces so employees will know where to go to park within those areas.

Mr. Klein clarified that the volumes were reversed concerning incoming traffic coming into the driveway section; left turn coming in has less traffic than right turns coming into the driveway.

He also clarified the number of trips coming into the driveway are total trips, not just incoming.

Chair O'Brien previously expressed concern with the availability of electric for the flashing beacons. Mr. Klein advised that they are solar powered and run on a little battery for 30 days with no sun.

Mr. Cucinotta talked about design waivers that pertain to the parking lot. The first waiver is for the length of the parking spaces to be 18 feet even though 20 feet is required under the Land Use Ordinance. The two-foot difference is suitable for the parking of the vehicles. It is consistent with ADA compliant parking spaces around Carnegie Center.

Ms. Mandel thought that ADA-parking in the area was all 20 feet. The existing lot for Building 508 has standard 20 foot ADA parking. The waiver is for the interim lot at Building 408 when the building is constructed.

The second waiver is for excluding van spaces while the interim parking lot is used as overflow parking. Since the spaces will serve as existing vehicle overflow, there is no need for van spaces until Building 408 is constructed.

Section 200-27 (n) (3) of the Township Land Use Ordinance touches on driveway width of 24 feet rather than 30 feet where bicycle and motor vehicle access come together. Applicant believes this is suitable for the condition. Mr. Thomas touched on this item as it relates to the proposed road diet.

Chair O'Brien added that this condition depends upon the bicycle parking still being put in this proposed parking lot.

There is one waiver that applies to the parking lot alone. That is a waiver for non-porous surface for select parking spaces.

Mr. Burgis asked for clarification of Item I on page 4 of his report, concerning total number of spaces for Building 508. There is an issue about bike spaces. The standard is one bike space for every 20 parking spaces. Based on 438 parking spaces in Building 508 and additional 271 spaces in the interim parking lot 408, the number of bike spaces needed is 35 or 36.

Chair O'Brien explained that of the 271 spaces in the interim lot, only 150 spaces will be used by Building 508. The additional 121 spaces most likely will not be used until Building 408 is built.

There was discussion as to whether or not bicycle spaces should be put in the interim lot at this time. There is already plenty of bicycle parking throughout the campus. No new employees are being added and everybody that rides a bike today has parking. However, since this is part of the plan, the applicant will provide 14 spaces for bikes in the interim lot.

Mr. Guzik went over the items in his report.

Item 1.01, concerns information required by the checklist that were somewhat incomplete.

First bullet in Item 1.01, Mr. Moore said that the applicant will choose the alternate option and have a licensed land surveyor add a certification statement to the Existing Condition Plan.

The applicant agrees to supply all the information requested in bullets two through five of Item 1.01.

Bullet six, with respect to the wetlands, the applicant applied for the LOI. Once the LOI is received, they will provide the metes and bounds information.

Item 2.01, Mr. Guzik was fine with the applicant not applying for a fill permit from NJDEP because they are not disturbing the wetlands at this time.

Item 3.01, Mr. Guzik said that a design waiver is needed because the parking being provided for one identified tenant exceeds the ordinance.

Item 3.03, the crosswalk at the entrance driveway to the parking lot is not shown on the plan to be barrier free. Mr. Thomas advised that the crosswalk will be barrier free.

Mr. Guzik asked if and how the applicant intends to prevent people from crossing South Transverse Road at several undesired locations. Mr. Thomas said there will be bushes, shrubbery and trees. There are two sidewalk entrances on South Transverse Road to the main sidewalk. Otherwise, there are no other accessible spots to get to that sidewalk.

Item 3.04 concerns the width of the driveway where bicycle access and vehicle access are combined into a single driveway. Applicant is proposing 24-foot width because South Transverse Road cannot accommodate the standard 30-foot width. Also, 30-foot width will impact the design of the interim lot and the design of the future build out of Building 408.

An alternative option of widening the sidewalk to a shared use width of eight feet was offered. The applicant said that they prefer to keep bikes on the roadway. Mr. Guzik said that the driveway width should be 30-feet then if bikes are to stay on the road.

The applicant agreed to widen the walkway from five feet to eight feet and include a cut out for bikes to go up on the sidewalk when they get to the driveway.

Item 3.05, the applicant agrees to enhance the bus stop on the east side of South Transverse Road to match the bus stop on the west side.

Items 4.04, 4.05 and 4.06 are technical comments with regards to water quality treatment design. The applicant will comply with these requirements. Mr. Thomas will reach out to the township engineer to address Mr. Guzik's concern in Item 4.04.

Item 4.07 concerns Ordinance Section 200-36.1, which requires pervious surfaces for the parking lot. Mr. Guzik is fine with the extent of the pervious surface, 193 out of 271 spaces, proposed in the parking lot and will not object to this waiver.

Item 4.08 is a technical comment related to the Stormwater BMP Manual. Once the changes are made and there is an agreement, the deed notice will be recorded along with an easement typically provided over the stormwater management areas, including the porous pavement areas protecting and preserving same.

Item 5.01, a Treatment Works Approval application from NJDEP is required since the sanitary sewer main is an extension of the existing sewer collection system. If the main is built in the parking lot only, and does not connect to South Transverse Road, then this is not required.

Mr. Moore said that the applicant will build the sewer main in the parking lot only.

Item 5.02, installation of grease traps can be deferred and shown as a future improvement.

Item 5.03 is no longer applicable since the sewer main is not being extended to South Transverse Road.

Item 5.04 and 5.05 are related to the design of the sanitary sewer line. Applicant will comply with these items.

Item 6.0, Mr. Guzik asked how the lighting will be controlled on the site. He was advised that it will be a panel time clock located on the property.

Item 7.01, the applicant will comply with "a" through "h".

Item 7.02, Mr. Moore said that a construction cost estimate will be provided, but a performance guarantee is not needed because there are no public improvements. Mr. Guzik will review the ordinance.

Ms. Geevers revisited the topic of the fire hydrants and asked for confirmation that they are not needed for the parking lot and will be installed when the building is built. Chair O'Brien suggested a condition for potential approval that stipulates the applicant will meet with Mr. Yates concerning this issue. Mr. Moore is fine with this condition.

Ms. Geevers asked if the bike racks will be made of metal. She stated that metal will rust so, if they are not needed now, they should not be installed.

Mr. Kochenour talked about the items in his report dated January 28, 2019.

The first two comments in the Traffic Impact Study deal with allotment of parking spaces. There was sufficient testimony to address this issue.

Items 3, 4 and 5 are minor typo changes that need to be made. These changes do not affect any conclusions in the reports.

Item 1a, in the Site Plan section, deals with general notes from Sheet 2 of 25. A waiver for the length of the handicap-accessible spaces was addressed.

Item 1b, there seems to be a discrepancy in the number of proposed spaces of 706. When you add up the standard spaces, compact spaces, and handicap spaces, it equals 736. Mr. Kochenour is asking for clarification.

Item 1c, there are seven proposed handicapped spaces shown by the existing 508 building that are intended for use by Building 508 employees. No handicapped spaces are provided in proposed building 408 lot at this time. Eight spaces are "ghosted" in.

In response, Chair O'Brien explained that Sheet Six shows restriping to accommodate this handicapped parking to match these additional spaces.

Item 2 requests that the pedestrian crossings along South Transverse Road be handicapped accessible.

Item 5, a decision was made to not include compact and commuter spaces with this application.

Item 7, Mr. Thomas confirmed this is the loading area.

Item 8, the code requires any end islands to be a minimum of ten feet. One island scales seven feet wide and adjacent to this island is a cross-hatched area. Mr. Moore said that all islands will conform with ten feet.

Items 9, 10 and 11, it was agreed that there would be a condition that Mr. Kochenour and Mr. Thomas will meet about these items.

The applicant will agree to Items 12-16.

Chair O'Brien brought up Mr. Hoberman's desire to see a crosswalk where South Transverse Road comes off of Carnegie Center Drive. Chair O'Brien said that since the blinking lights are solar powered with battery backup and does not require electric, there should be a crosswalk in this location with a blinking signal.

Mr. Klein said that a flashing beacon in this location would not be appropriate since there is a stop sign at this crosswalk. Typically, installation of a beacon is when you don't expect to see someone cross. Intersections are recognized as pedestrian crossings

The applicant has agreed to put a crosswalk across South Transverse Road. This prompted Ms. Mandel to ask if there can also be an entrance to the parking lot at this location.

Mr. Cucinotta explained that the reason for that sidewalk is to connect other buildings to the greenway. The crosswalk has nothing to do with the parking lot. It has to do with connecting Building 302 down to the greenway.

Mr. Cucinotta said that there will be a 100-foot gap in the sidewalk at the northern corner of this lot when they build the "orange" walk on the plan. At the time Building 408 is built there will be a need to access that section.

Mr. Dobromilsky went over his report dated January 29, 2019.

Item 1, the 99 new trees being planted will compensate for the 83 trees being removed so there is no negative impact upon the community forest resource.

Item 2, Mr. Dobromilsky asked why seven trees are being removed. The applicant replied that the trees being removed are located within the limit of the grading proposed in the plan. They will try to save these trees if possible.

Item 4a, a double row of trees will be planted along the east side of South Transverse Road frontage and buffer associated with the lot.

Item 4b, Mr. Dobromilsky explained that the code of subdividing parking lots into modules separated by a 10-foot wide landscape island is not being followed because of the extensive greenway. A waiver is needed, but there is a strong reason to grant it.

Item 4c, a waiver is required for a deficiency of 26 parking lot trees. The twelve (12) trees along one edge, and eight (8) along the other edge are not included as parking lot trees.

Item 4d, some of the light fixtures need to be twisted and flush to the finished grade.

Item 4e, applicant agrees to add seven (7) trees to the northeast side of the detention basin.

Item 4f, the applicant agrees to review the plant species being used.

Chair O'Brien explained that application PB 18-11 is a three-prong application. The first action is approval of the interim parking lot, second action is a 20-year extension of the Preliminary B site plan approval, and third is to update the design guidelines.

Mr. Burgis addressed the second item concerning an extension. He said that the way the statute is worded, there is a certain period of time for development so it provides for an extension. It is not unusual to seek an extension.

Chair O'Brien said that the Board will not vote on the parking lot tonight because it is a combined application. Mr. Moore said that this is a problem for the applicant.

Counsel Muller said that partial approval is acceptable.

Mr. Surtees told Mr. Moore that he can withdraw the request for the design waiver changes and extension. At a future date, an application can be made specific for those two items.

Mr. Moore agreed to withdraw these two items and re-apply.

There was no public testimony for the interim parking lot of future Building 408.

Mr. Pankove made a motion to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Karp. Voice vote; motion approved.

Counsel Muller summarized 14 waivers and the conditions from the professional's reports.

Mr. Hoberman made a motion to approve PB18-11 with waivers and conditions. Seconded by Ms. Geever. Motion was unanimously approved, 9-0, by roll call vote.

Being that there is no other business before the Board, Chair O'Brien adjourned the meeting at 10:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Terri Jany
Recording Secretary