

BOROUGH OF RARITAN
Planning Board Meeting
MINUTES
April 27, 2022

CALL TO ORDER & FLAG SALUTE

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m. in the Borough of Raritan Municipal Building. Chairwoman Thomas read the open public meetings statement into the record.

ROLL CALL

Present

Debra Thomas
Mayor Bray
Councilman Carra
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Delacruz
Ms. Carra
Ms. Goetsch
Ms. Windrem
Ms. Sherwin
Mr. Brown
Mr. Decicco

Also Present

Larry Cohen, Board Attorney
Stan Schrek, Board Engineer
Lou Gara, Zoning/Construction Official

Ms. Thomas acknowledged the contributions of the late John LaMastra.

MINUTES

The Minutes of 3/23/22 were tabled. **Motion** by Mr. Cunningham, **seconded** by Mr. Brown and unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of **4/6/22** as presented, by voice vote.

CONSTRUCTION/ZONING OFFICIAL REPORT

Mr. Gara provided updates on the following matters:

- Coffee shop and cigar store coming (next to Papa Johns).
- Applications received for shopping center on Rt. 206 near Bagels4U mainly barbers and hair salons.
- Labcorp almost finished.
- Johnson&Johnson brought in more applications; finishing work in larger building.
- Footing&Foundation permit issued for apartments on Orlando Drive.
- Pharmacy converting to hair salon.
- LaGrange likely coming before TRC.
- Same person bought old Nik's/Corner Bar (1st&5th). Architecturals to convert Nik's into restaurant being prepared. Unknown what use will be on 5th.
- House on corner of Somerset St. moving forward/working out details on intersection with County. Mr. Gara advised to bring any property maintenance issues to his attention. Ms. Thomas commented on same.
- Mr. Gara advised Mr. Brown he would look into whether violations were issued with respect to Stop N Shop property maintenance issues.

TRC MEETING UPDATE

Ms. Thomas advised that the TRC discussed the redevelopment of Raritan Crossing on Route 206 which Mr. Schrek would provide a report on this evening and would be discussed in May. She advised that the TRC would meet again on 5/4/22, pending availability of the professionals, sans Ms. Goetsch and Mr. Brown.

RESOLUTIONS

The Edgewood Properties and SD&RR approval resolutions were tabled.

APPLICATIONS/HEARINGS

- **Middle Valley Partners, LLC DBA Valley Wellness
Block 41, Lots 2&3
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan with Variances**

Brian Tipton, Esq. entered his appearance on behalf of the applicant and spoke about the regulatory framework for the project. Mr. Tipton advised that the proposal was for Preliminary and Final Site Plan with bulk variances (including parking) to accommodate a Medical Cannabis Treatment Center on the Uneeda site.

Seth Tipton, Esq. was sworn and qualified as an expert in Cannabis Law. Mr. Tipton provided an overview of the company as well as a historical data on the formation/evolution of the business. Limitations of the license were discussed. Mr. Tipton clarified that in addition to state licensing, MVP would have to obtain municipal approvals in order to expand the business outside the scope of medical use/sales. He further related that the applicant had exhausted their search for alternate locations.

Wayne Ingram, P.E., P.L.S., P.P. was sworn and qualified. Referring to **Exhibit "MVP 1,"** which was identified as a colored rendering of the Site Plan from the plan set, Mr. Ingram reviewed existing and proposed conditions on the site, including existing business, existing parking (23 spaces), a new proposed entrance/vestibule and sidewalk along the frontage, the location of the trash enclosure and minor lighting upgrades for security purposes, [3 downward facing, building mounted receptacles]. He confirmed that ATC's were a permitted use in the zone and that the project would be developed in accordance with ADA/accessibility standards.

Mr. Ingram advised that there would be a de minimus change in impervious coverage (from 86 to 88) and that calculations for minor upgrades to drainage along the front of the building would be provided to Mr. Schrek. He testified that there were no Stormwater impacts and confirmed that no new landscaping was being proposed.

Mr. Ingram reviewed Mr. Schrek's memo dated 4/1/22, and offered the following comments:

- Fire Department requirements - will comply with any building/code requirements.
- Traffic - deferred to Traffic Engineer.
- Sidewalk along Route 202 – to be removed from application in order to prevent delays.
- Generator – for emergency use only/required for use/will comply with State noise code.
- Side Entrance – Not ADA compliant because more of a service entrance/not for public access.

With respect to overall changes to the site, Mr. Ingram referenced an aerial photo from 2002 and testified that there had been no changes from a stormwater perspective. He testified that none of the proposed changes trigger stormwater management requirements. He also noted a reduction in impervious coverage from the 70's to 2002.

The addition of a parking space from the prior proposal was discussed. Mr. Tipton attributed this (23rd) space to a slight shift in striping. Mr. Cohen pointed out that some stalls were not sized for the Ordinance. Mr. Ingram advised that this would be addressed.

Noise generation from the generator was discussed. Mr. Ingram advised that testing would be done mid-day so as not to disturb neighbors.

Mr. Schrek advised that he wanted the stormwater system to be verified for functionality and that he wanted to

see the cut sheets on the generator.

A discussion on waivers ensued. Mr. Ingram advised that design waivers were not addressed during completeness. The following items were discussed:

- Mr. Schrek advised that he would review the cut sheets for the lighting.
- Mr. Schrek indicated that he had no issue granting a waiver for the loading/unloading space as there were no issues with the existing loading dock.
- Mr. Schrek deferred to the Board on landscaping/buffering between the residential and commercial spaces. The existing buffering (fence) was discussed. Mr. Tipton advised that the old stockade fence was replaced in 2021.
- Mr. Ingram advised that dumpsters were not currently in enclosures and that they were not proposing to enclose them. Mr. Cohen asked about any increase in solid waste. Mr. Ingram deferred to Ms. Trent.
- Speaking to comments from the Fire Department, Mr. Ingram identified the connection and advised that they would maintain the striped area/provide improved access with sidewalks.
- Mr. Gara advised that Ms. Trent had already addressed comments from the Police Department.

Mr. DeCicco asked what the Ordinance says about having two businesses in one building, mentioning liquor stores in particular. Mr. Cohen advised that while Site Plan approval would be required, it was not prohibited.

Mr. Brown related that there had been no mention of the generator in TRC and spoke about the Board's prior experiences with same. He asked for testimony with respect to the distance from the generator to the nearest residences. Mr. Ingram provided testimony on the generator which Mr. Brown suggested was not adequate. He suggested they return with additional information, including decibel levels. Size and testing procedures were discussed. Mr. Ingram offered that Ms. Seminaria had more information. Mr. Gara spoke to the ordinance requirement of 5' from property line. Mr. Tipton advised that they looked for the least intrusive location.

Mr. Ingram provided testimony on lighting in response to a question from Ms. Carra about the impact of lighting on the residential area.

Chairwoman Thomas opened the floor to questions of the witnesses at 7:20. There were none.

Virginia Seminara, Architect was sworn and qualified. Ms. Seminaria testified that the generator would be natural gas and likely sized at 8kw, to be used for prolonged outages only. Speaking from the audience, Ms. Trent advised that security regulations require backup power.

Exhibit "MVP 2" was identified as a colored rendering showing a 3d view southbound on Route 202 with front elevations and floor plan, marked into testimony and discussed. Ms. Seminaria testified that the proposal includes creation of an additional door in the front for fire access.

Referencing Sheet A2, Ms. Seminaria corrected engineering testimony with respect to size (2476 gross square feet). She provided testimony on the creation of a mezzanine and confirmed that there would be no use of the basement. Ms. Seminaria identified the waiting area, counter and [access controlled] back area and spoke about procedures for accessing same. She identified the stairway to the mezzanine and testified that the structure would meet Code requirements.

Referring to "A1," Ms. Seminaria provided testimony on signage. She spoke about the proposed additional projecting sign to be located perpendicular to the building at length. Ms. Seminaria testified that the name on the sign would be "Valley Wellness." In response to a question from Mr. Cohen as to whether the signs would conform, Mr. Tipton advised that Mr. Ingram would provide additional testimony. A brief discussion ensued about the amount of signage permitted by ordinance and whether the Uneeda sign exists by way of variance or just predates

zoning. Ms. Seminaria testified that the sign would project 8' on each side and confirmed that the present location of the Uneeda sign would remain unchanged.

Ms. Trent testified that the State does not allow signs to be lit in response to a question from Ms. Thomas. Ms. Seminaria indicated that Ms. Trent would provide additional testimony. Mr. Brown asked where the conduit for the generator would run. Ms. Seminaria indicated that they would need to figure out a way underground. Mr. Cohen offered that it would have to go under the parking lot and around the building.

Chairwoman Thomas opened the floor to questions of the witness at 7:34. There were none.

Sarah Trent, Principal of Middle Valley Wellness was sworn and qualified. Ms. Trent testified that all doors inside of the facility would be access controlled and that there would be a security guard from a third-party company stationed at the entrance. She provided an extensive overview of how the process would flow from access to point of sale as well as operational info as follows:

- Hours of operation (10am to 6pm although allowed from 8am to 8pm).
- Facility access (front door only; side door restructured to cash pick up and product delivery only).
- Methods for purchasing (online, curbside pickup, in store waiting area or dispensary floor).
- Access control/security features/cameras (requirements for operations to be on live feed to regulatory commission). Ms. Trent advised that video access was offered to the Police Department and that security personnel met with the Chief.
- Waste (said to be minimal as cannabis waste must be disposed of under regulatory guidelines; stored in vault until transport to incinerator).
- Generator (for emergency use only; to be located on Route 202). Ms. Trent testified that security features must be up and running at all times so the generator must be provided. She advised that they anticipate running the gas line under the lot.
- Lighting (safety feature in accordance with State requirements; signage cannot be lit).

In response to a question from Ms. Thomas about deliveries, Ms. Trent testified that they would be made during regular business hours when security is on site but not at scheduled times. She testified that there would be no odor generation in response to question from Mr. DeCicco. Mr. DeCicco asked about a traffic study which Ms. Trent advised they would talk about.

Ms. Trent provided testimony on the size and type of delivery vehicles anticipated (small, SUV type white or black unmarked vehicles). Ms. Thomas commented on hours of operation (10am to 6pm; 7 days/week).

Mr. Brown asked how cash/cash pick up is handled. Ms. Trent advised that while it is primarily a cash business, it is moving in other directions and that they would employ a form of cashless payment/accept debit cards. She testified that cash pick-ups would be made 2-3 times per week and that the manager would make daily drops in the vault stationed next to the DEA cage.

Ms. Trent provided testimony about dispensary operations, including details on employee credentials and dosages at the behest of Mr. Schrek. Ms. Trent advised that she runs a training program through County Colleges. She testified that there is no taste testing on site and no product kept in the reception area.

Mr. Cunningham spoke about the difference between medical and recreational use, as reviewed by the Cannabis Subcommittee. Mayor Bray asked about prescription limits. Mr. Brown asked about average monthly costs. Ms. Trent related that the maximum allotment is 3oz unless terminally ill and that costs range from \$200.

Mr. Cohen asked for testimony on the number of employees/shifts as it relates to parking. He also asked for testimony on the need for 80 square feet of signage when only 20 is permitted. Ms. Trent testified that Uneeda has 2 signs; a façade and street fronting on 206. Citing symmetry, she suggested that it would appropriate to match

theirs. She confirmed that they would not have a “street sign.” As for the design, Ms. Trent testified that it would not have a marijuana leaf.

Ms. Trent provided testimony on foot traffic/parking and employees. She advised that 83 patients per day are projected [once established] with the average patient parking for 10 minutes in addition to 6 employees on site.

Ms. Trent testified that the mezzanine was incorporated into the proposal because use of the basement had to be abandoned due to water/air quality issues.

Mr. DeCicco commented on parking and was incredulous about the average amount of time that Ms. Trent indicated customers would be parked for. Mayor Bray and Ms. Thomas reminded him that the Traffic Engineer would speak about parking. Ms. Trent offered that the average time observed in other dispensaries was less than 10 minutes. Mr. Schrek suggested to Mr. DeCicco that he would be pleased with the Traffic Engineer’s testimony. Mr. Cohen reminded that patients can also order online. Ms. Trent advised that “very few” people browse. She responded to a question from Mayor Bray about the nearest medical facility (Union and Phillipsburg presently with a store coming soon to Flemington in particular).

Chairwoman Thomas opened the floor to questions of the public at 8:05.

William Masol, P.E. of French and Parrello provided testimony regarding the results of a parking demand analysis performed during peak business hours on February 26 and post TRC on Sat., 3/5, in particular.

Mr. Masol testified that the Ordinance requires 16 spaces for Uneeda while MVP requires 1 space per 125 square feet, resulting in a total of 24 spaces. He added that most other alternative treatment centers use retail standards. Mr. Masol testified that the maximum number of vehicles anticipated at peak time would be 7, equating to 1 space per 250 square feet. In estimating demand for the facility at 7.19 spaces for every 1000 square feet of gross square footage (for a total of 21), he referenced NTE data but acknowledged a disparity as it does not differentiate between medical and recreational sales.

Mr. Masol provided data on parking counts that were performed at existing sites in both Union and Paterson during peak hours (from 10-11am on February 16 in Union and from 12-1pm on Feb 19 in Paterson) and surmised that an average of 7 spaces would be needed on weekends and 4 on weekdays [based on averages from both sites].

It was noted for the record that the following information would be highlighted on the website: Appointments encouraged for walk ins, curbside pickup, bike racks sidewalk along Rt. 202 and nearby transit. Incentives for employees using transit/bikes would also be provided.

Mr. Masol estimated that there would be a maximum of 83 patients per day at 10 per hour, applying a 50% surge factor. He testified that the length of stay they observed at the other facilities averaged 7 minutes and that demand would result in 16 for both businesses on site. In summarizing, Mr. Masol pointed out that traffic demand will decrease as other facilities open.

Mr. Cunningham asked whether he considered the number of licensees in the area. Mr. Masol indicated that he was not sure that the location of patients is available. Mr. Cunningham stated that he thought you chose your facility. Ms. Goetsch asked how many doctors prescribe in a given area. Ms. Trent advised that there are 122,000 medical patients in the State and approximately 2,000 prescribers but that there is no patient data by location and that prescriber locations are not accessible on the CRC website. Mr. Cunningham suggested that certain areas in the State might have a higher concentration of patients due to demographics (namely age). Ms. Trent confirmed that patients are not restricted to location.

Mr. Cohen asked what the benefit of medical marijuana would be in light of recreational licensing. Ms. Trent

responded that medical grade marijuana has a higher potency. Mr. Cohen asked what would stop re-sale. Ms. Sherwin asked about access for incapacitated patients. Ms. Trent explained that each patient has up to two registered caregivers who are subject to a background check.

Mr. Brown commented that there is obviously no issue for Uneeda if they are renting to Ms. Trent. She related that no issues were anticipated. Mr. DeCicco commented on the number of spaces being provided and asked whether they looked at traffic on the street.

Chairwoman Thomas opened the floor to questions of the public at 8:27.

Wayne Ingram, P.E., P.L.S., P.P. returned with Planning Testimony. Mr. Ingram testified as to preexisting variance conditions in the setbacks. Deferring to engineering testimony, Mr. Ingram testified that there would be no negative impacts to granting the parking variance.

Mr. Ingram testified that a slight increase in impervious coverage (75% is permitted, site is currently at 86.1% and 88.6% is proposed) would have no negative impacts visually or to stormwater.

Mr. Ingram testified that the proposed signage would be in keeping with the and that the site could accommodate it. Calling them aesthetically fitting and needed for site recognition as well as safety, he offered that the signage would have no impact on the zone plan. He testified that it would promote the general welfare. With respect to the projection sign in particular (20 square feet proposed), he testified that it would add character to the right side of the building in addition and helping to avoid confusion and enhance recognition.

Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Ingram if the c2 criteria was satisfied and he indicated it was, with the exception of the pre-existing conditions. Mr. Tipton confirmed it was all c2 and satisfied purposes A and G by promoting the general health/welfare as well as a desirable visual environment.

Mr. Ingram testified that the location was particularly suited for the use and meets all locational requirements.

Chairwoman Thomas opened the Board to questions of the witness at 8:39. There were none.

Mr. Tipton proffered a closing statement.

Chairwoman Thomas opened the Board to questions from the public about the application. There were none.

Mr. Cohen offered that parking was the most sensitive of the variances. Mayor Bray offered that the applicant is being held to the same standard as urgent care. Mr. Cohen offered that Raritan's Ordinance has higher requirements than other places. An extensive discussion ensued about parking. Ms. Thomas commented on the credibility of testimony (traffic engineer in particular) as well as the idea that the owner of the site takes no exception with the proposal. Ms. Goetsch commented on the fact that they studied other facilities. Mr. DeCicco asserted that the Board never granted a parking variance with such disparity in numbers. Mayor Bray commented that it was unfair that they were being held to the same standard as a medical facility. Ms. Thomas asserted that the applicant did a great job proving that. Mr. Decicco commented further.

Referring to Mr. DeCicco's [earlier] example of a liquor store, Mr. Cohen advised that it would meet parking requirements. Mr. Decicco offered that families going to Uneeda will see "what is going on" [there]. Mr. Cohen asserted that the only reason they don't meet the requirements is because of their classification as a medical use. Mr. Schreck spoke about how the medical parking standard came into being. He asserted that he would have no problem granting the relief. Mr. DeCicco held that there was a parking shortage "all over."

The Chairwoman polled the Board. Mr. Schreck commented that the approval was limited to medical marijuana sales

only. Mr. Cohen suggested a condition of approval be added that they would have to return to the Board for any other type of facility. Mr. DeCicco asserted that traffic/parking are very important.

Mr. Cohen asked if there were issues with any of the other variances. None were offered. He suggested that the waiver be granted for the dumpster enclosure. There were no objections.

Mr. Cohen asked if there were any revisions needed to the Site Plan and confirmed that the attorney said he would consult with Mr. Schrek on the generator. Mr. Cohen confirmed that this would be handled to the satisfaction of the Board Engineer. Mr. Schrek offered that they would like to review the stormwater system for integrity. The applicant's team agreed that they would consent to any recommended improvements.

Motion by Mr. Cunningham, **seconded** by Ms. Goetsch to approve the application for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with variances (with conditions as set forth in testimony, outlined in Mr. Schreck's review letter dated 4/1/22 and as outlined in the resolution of approval).

ROLL CALL:

AYE: AYE: Ms. Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Delacruz, Ms. Carra, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Brown

NAY: Mr. DeCicco

ABSTAIN:

APPLICATION/HEARING

- **Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.**
1000 US Route 202 (Block 2, Lots 3.01 and 18) – Minor Site Plan
- **Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.**
920 US Route 202 (Block 2, Lot 17) – Minor Site Plan
- **Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc.**
700 US Route 202 (Block 2, Lot 16) – Minor Site Plan

In light of common ownership and relative nature of the properties creating the potential for overlapping testimony, the Board heard all 3 applications simultaneously.

Tom Letizia, Esq. of Troutman Pepper entered his appearance on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Letizia identified two items identified in Mr. Schrek's review memos as already having been addressed [Green Checklist and Tax Verification]. The application was deemed complete for hearing. Mr. Cohen confirmed that Notice was not required.

AS TO COMPLETENESS:

Motion by Mayor Bray, **seconded** by Mr. Delacruz to deem the applications complete/proceed with hearing.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Ms. Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Delacruz, Ms. Carra, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

Mr. Letizia explained that Janssen is a 235 acre campus consisting of 11 lots (in different zones) north of Route 202. He explained that the proposals involve minor external improvements that would be considered building upgrades and outlined them as follows:

Building 100 (OM3 Zone)

Rooftop equipment which will be screened and will comply with zoning and height requirements to be located

1700' from nearest residence and 900' from Route 202.

Building 700 (P1 Zone)

Upgrades will be to the existing office building which is permitted in the zone, to include external mechanical upgrades as well as a 10'x30' concrete pad for emergency generator and 3.5' x 8' concrete pad for the condenser. Mr. Letizia explained that this is the closest building to a residential community.

Building 920 (Zone not provided)

New celestary and addition on north side to enlarge the lobby. Vestibule to be removed at south entrance and shifted nearby resulting in a 200 square foot reduction in coverage.

Rob Espasa P.E., LEED, AP of PS&S, LLC and was sworn/qualified. Mr. Espasa identified **Exhibit A-1** as an aerial photo of the existing buildings and marked it into testimony. He identified **Exhibit A-2** as the Site Plan for Building 700 and marked it into testimony as well.

A discussion ensued as to whether the depression (as identified on the plan) would affect stormwater management. He testified that impacts on drainage would be deminimus. Mr. Espasa indicated that there were no other engineering issues associated with the proposal. Mr. Schrek concurred.

Ryan Andrulewich, A.I.A. was sworn and qualified. Mr. Andrulewich identified an architectural diagram which he entered into testimony as **Exhibit A-3** and discussed. He provided testimony on noise levels and elevations; both of which he related, would be conforming.

Keith Crabiel, A.I.A. was sworn and qualified. Mr. Crabiel identified **Exhibit A-4** as architectural roof plans for Building 920 and marked it into testimony. He testified that there would be no net impact to parking or utilities as a result of the proposal. Mr. Crabiel testified that the southwest entrance would be removed and that expansion would occur on the north side for the sake of pedestrian flow. He explained that they would be adding natural light with the bump up in the clear story and that the proposal would comply with height requirements.

Exhibit A-5 was identified as elevations and rendering of the clear story and marked into testimony. Mr. Crabiel referred back to Exhibit A-4 wherein accessible access was identified.

Chairwoman Thomas opened the floor to questions of the witnesses at 9:31. There were none.

Mr. Crabiel identified **Exhibit A-6** as roof plans and elevations for Building 700 and marked it into testimony. He identified 4 existing rooftop units to be replaced with 5 full pak units with screens that would conform to height requirements.

Exhibit A-7 was identified as images of rooftop screening from adjacent properties and marked into testimony. Referring to a roof RTU Screen Visibility Study performed by "Cerami," Mr. Crabiel provided testimony on visibility and noise. Mr. Brown asked about run time. Noise impacts were discussed.

With respect to the generator for Building 700, Mr. Crabiel testified that the unit would be a 450KW diesel with sound attenuation enclosure and direct ug feed because it supports patients. The tank system was discussed in response to a question from Mr. Brown about the oil tray. Mr. Crabiel identified the generator on Exhibit A-1. He responded to questions about the barrier (said to be natural and fenced) from Mr. Brown. Mr. Espassa added that testing is done on a monthly basis for 30 minutes during daytime hours. Mr. Cunningham asked Mr. Schrek about the proximity to houses. Mr. Schrek asked about the patient support aspect. Mr. Espassa clarified that it supports a call center which supports patients.

Mr. Letizia clarified that the relief being sought for Building 1000 was for rooftop HVAC equipment only.

Motion by Mayor Bray, **seconded** by Mr. Brown to approve the Minor Site Plan, with conditions as set forth in

testimony, as contained in Mr. Schrek's review letter dated 4/21/22 and as outlined in the approval resolution.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Ms. Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Delacruz, Ms. Carra, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

Mr. Letizia clarified that the relief being sought for Building 700 was for new rooftop equipment and concrete pads for the generator and condenser.

Motion by Ms. Carra, **seconded** by Mr. Decicco to approve the Minor Site Plan, with conditions as set forth in testimony, as contained in Mr. Schrek's review letter dated 4/21/22 and as outlined in the approval resolution.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Ms. Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Delacruz, Ms. Carra, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

Mr. Letizia clarified that the relief being sought for Building 920 was for a new clear story and 350 square foot addition to enlarge the lobby to be offset by the removal of a 200 square foot vestibule.

Motion by Ms. Windrem, **seconded** by Councilman Carra to approve the Minor Site Plan, with conditions as set forth in testimony, as contained in Mr. Schrek's review letter dated 4/21/22 and as outlined in the approval resolution.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Ms. Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Delacruz, Ms. Carra, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

APPLICATION

- **40 East Somerset Street
Block 109, Lot 1
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with Variances**

Completeness was discussed. In the absence of any request for waivers and in the absence of the applicant, further discussion was held in abeyance and the application was deemed incomplete.

DISCUSSION/MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Schrek advised that he would be distributing copies of the Redevelopment Plan for the Raritan Crossing site. Mr. Cohen explained that the site had been deemed an area in need of redevelopment and that it was being referred to the Board for preparation of the redevelopment plan. He spoke about procedures. Mr. Schrek offered that he would summarize his report at the next meeting.

Motion by Mr. Cunningham, **seconded** by Councilman Carra to adjourn the meeting at 9:52.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Probst

Nancy Probst, Board Secretary

APPROVED 5/25/22