

**BOROUGH OF RARITAN  
PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES**

March 9, 2026

A YouTube video of the meeting is available on the Borough website

**CALL TO ORDER & FLAG SALUTE**

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. in the Borough of Raritan Municipal Building. Ms. Windrem read the Open Public Meetings statement into the record and led the pledge of allegiance.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present**

Mayor Tozzi  
Ms. Windrem  
Mr. Cunningham  
Mr. Gara  
Mr. Murphy  
Mr. Brown  
Mr. Gussman  
Mr. Jayaraj  
Ms. Thomas

**Also Present**

Matt Flynn, Board Attorney  
Joe Brosnan, Board Engineer/Planner  
Lou Gara, Construction/Zoning Official, Board Secretary  
Mark Peck, Conflict Counsel

**Absent**

Chairman LoPresti  
Councilman Harwood

Motion by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Mayor Tozzi and unanimously carried to enter executive session.

Motion by Mayor Tozzi, seconded by Mr. Brown and unanimously carried to end executive session.

Ms. Windrem discussed the procedures to be followed for the meeting and read a statement submitted by Mr. LoPresti recusing himself from the matters before the board regarding affordable housing. Ms. Windrem introduced Mark Peck, conflict attorney, to explain the conflict-of-interest statutes and render his opinion on the concerns raised by the public and the board.

Mark Peck, Conflict Counsel discussed the conflict-of-interest concerns raised at the February 25, 2026, meeting regarding Chairman LoPresti, Jim Kyle, and Matt Flynn. Mr. Peck explained the laws and regulations regarding conflict-of-interest and stated that there are no apparent conflicts.

Motion by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Mayor Tozzi to reinstate Mr. Flynn and Mr. Kyle for fair share housing matters.

**Roll Call:**

**Aye:** Mayor Tozzi, Ms. Windrem, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Gara, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gussman, Mr. Jayaraj, Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** None

The public was given the opportunity to ask Mr. Peck questions regarding these issues. Mr. Timms, Lagrange St. asked about the relationship between Rocco Campanella, architect and Mr. LoPresti, and if there is a conflict with Mr. LoPresti as he has a real estate business in town, Mr. Flynn responded that he would advise a member to recuse if they had a financial interest in a matter before the board, Mr. Peck responded that it would have to be looked at on a case by case basis and that it was common for members of the board to also be business owners in the municipalities in which they serve on the planning board. Mr. Dinsmore, Victoria St. asked about Mr. Peck's relationship with an application before the Township of Bridgewater and if he discussed the matter with Mr. Flynn. Mr. Peck stated he asked Mr. Flynn the status of the proceedings in Bridgewater but did not discuss anything else regarding the application. Ms. Schwall, Obert Dr. asked why Mr. Flynn is seated on the dais and if it is legal. Ms. Windrem responded that she asked Mr. Flynn to sit on the dais and there is nothing that prevents the board's professionals from being seated on the dais. Ms. Rose, Woodmere St. asked if it was a conflict for Mr. Flynn to remind the board and the public about the affordable housing deadlines and that a motion was needed to carry the hearing to a future meeting after he recused himself from the affordable housing matters before the board at the February 25, 2026, meeting. Mr. Peck responded that it was not a conflict in his opinion for Mr. Flynn to discuss procedural requirements related to the affordable housing matters before the board. Ms. Rose questioned the relationship with Mr. Kyle and Mr. Brosnan the Borough affordable housing planner and planning board planner, and there is information missing or incorrect in the historical data relating to permits and certificate of occupancies referenced in the proposed fourth round affordable housing plan. Ms. Windrem stated Mr. Peck is here to discuss the conflict-of-interest allegations and that question can be discussed at the hearing on the plan. Mr. Allen, Granetz Pl., asked if there is a conflict of interest for Mr. LoPresti being he is employed in the real estate business to sit on the board. Mr. Peck stated that if he had a personal interest in a specific project, it would be and it is common for developers and real estate professionals to sit on planning boards.

#### MINUTES

**Motion** by Mr. Cunningham, **seconded** by Mr. Jayaraj to approve the Minutes of February 25, 2026, as presented.

#### Roll Call:

**Aye:** Mayor Tozzi, Ms. Windrem, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Gara, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gussman, Mr. Jayaraj, Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** None

#### PROFESSIONAL REPORTS

No reports given

#### APPLICATIONS/HEARINGS

- **Amended Housing Element and Fair Share Plan**

Mr. Flynn introduced Mr. Kyle to discuss the proposed amendments to the fourth-round affordable housing plan and the consent orders that came out of the two challenges that were filed to the adopted plan. Mr. Kyle stated that he prepared the third-round plan and the analysis that was conducted for the fourth-round plan regarding vacant land adjustments and bonus credits. Mr. Kyle discussed the Agway property and how he arrived at the numbers in the plan. Mr. Kyle discussed the data sets referenced in the plan. Mr. Cunningham asked about the Zeus property and the

property on Route 28 near Vanderveer Rd. and Mr. Kyle responded. Ms. Thomas asked how many more rounds there would be and when these mandates end, Mr. Kyle responded. Ms. Windrem asked about other towns' challenges and Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Timms read from a centennial document from 1968 and a prepared statement and discussed and provided an exhibit. Mr. Timms asked how the number of apartments for the Agway project were decided and Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Timms asked about the adoption process of the affordable housing plan and Mr. Flynn responded. Ms. Schwall asked about an error in the block number in the plan for the Agway property, Mr. Timms expanded on the question and Mr. Flynn responded. Ms. Schwall asked about bonus credits, Mr. Timms expanded on the question and Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Timms asked about filing requests for extensions and Mr. Flynn responded. Mr. Patente asked if the plan was approved and questioned the number of units in the plan and Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Patente asked about the developability of the sites and Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Elgard, Glaser Ave stated the Busky Lane property is in a flood zone and asked about access to the property during a flood and Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Agarwal, Roderer Dr. requested clarification on the numbers and credits regarding the rehabilitation of existing homes, Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Agarwal asked if the habitat for humanity units are included in the plan, Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Agarwal questioned the 60 units for the Agway property. Mr. King, Vones Lane. stated the Borough has a land and affordability problem and asked if the State can come to the town and do a presentation and provide information. Mr. Kyle responded. Ms. Stander, First Ave stated another town partnered with a non-profit to develop affordable housing; is grant funding available? Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. McNally, Farrand St. is affordable housing considered veterans or seniors; who's it fair to that 10 percent of a development is required to be affordable and asked about pilot (payment in lieu of taxes) projects. Mr. Kyle stated in the plan 20 percent is required to be affordable and discussed the concepts of affordable housing and briefly discussed pilot programs. Ms. Rose asked how these areas being considered came about. Mr. Kyle responded. Ms. Rose questioned the information regarding permits and Mr. Gara responded. Mr. Taggart, Weiss Terr., asked about two apartment complexes on Orlando Dr. and if they included affordable housing; why they can't require a larger percentage of affordable units. Mr. Dinsmore asked about the sewer and water capacities and referenced and read from a report by Angela Knowles, Mr. Kyle responded. Mr. Dinsmore stated that Busky Lane was added at the eleventh hour and did not go to the redevelopment advisory committee. Joe Brosnan responded.

**Motion** by Mayor Tozzi, **seconded** by Mr. Murphy to approve the resolution as presented.

**Roll Call:**

**Aye:** Mayor Tozzi, Ms. Windrem, Mr. Gara, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Jayaraj,  
Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gussman

• **Master Plan Re-examination Report Planning Board Resolution 2026-05**

Mr. Brosnan discussed the reasons for a re-examination plan. Mr. Brosnan stated the master plan reexamination incorporates the affordable housing ordinances into the master plan. Mr. Brosnan reviewed other aspects of the master plan and discussed those items. Mr. Brosnan recommends a complete review and assessment to the entire master plan soon, and that will require coordination between the Mayor and Council and the planning board. Mr. Brosnan recommended that the ordinances relating to affordable housing be approved to comply with the fourth-round affordable housing plan. Mr. Cunningham expressed his concerns with the amended master plan. Ms. Rose asked about electric vehicle charging stations and Mr. Brosnan responded. Mr. Patente asked if two-family homes are included in the plan, Mr. Brosnan responded. Mr. Copt, asked about the width of the greenway on Orlando Dr., Mr. Brosnan responded. Mr. Timms read from a Rutgers document, guiding principles of a master plan reexamination. Mr.

Timms expressed concern with the public input timeline. Asked about the reduction of commercial use at the Agway property, asked for the Busky Lane property to be removed, what are the exact terms of a climate change vulnerability study, Mr. Flynn and Mr. Brosnan responded. Mr. Timms submitted and read from an exhibit. Unidentified member of the public questioned the environmental resources, and the water shed improvement plan, Mr. Brosnan responded. Ms. Landesberg, Meehan Ave asked how many billable hours to do a complete master plan and does a complete master plan have to be done, Mr. Brosnan responded. Ms. Landesberg commented on the financial status of the Borough and expressed concerns with the back and forth between the council and the planning board.

**Motion** by Mayor Tozzi, **seconded** by Mr. Gussman, to approve the resolution as presented.

**Roll Call:**

**Aye:** Mayor Tozzi, Ms. Windrem, Mr. Gara, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Gussman, Mr. Jayaraj,  
Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Brown

- **Affordable Housing Ordinance 2026-03, Planning Board Resolution 2026-06 Consistency Review**

**Motion** by Ms. Thomas, **seconded** by Mr. Murphy to approve the resolution as presented.

**Roll Call:**

**Aye:** Ms. Windrem, Mr. Gara, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Jayaraj, Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gussman

- **Development Fee Ordinance 2026-04, Planning Board Resolution 2026-07 Consistency Review**

**Motion** by Ms. Thomas, **seconded** by Ms. Windrem to approve the resolution as presented.

**Roll Call:**

**Aye:** Ms. Windrem, Mr. Gara, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Jayaraj, Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gussman

- **Affordable Housing Overlay Zone Ordinance 2026-06, Planning Board Resolution 2026-08 Consistency Review**

**Motion** by Mr. Murphy, **seconded** by Ms. Windrem to approve the resolution as presented.

**Roll Call:**

**Aye:** Ms. Windrem, Mr. Gara, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Jayaraj, Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gussman

- **Affordable Housing Overlay Zone Ordinance 2026-07, Planning Board Resolution 2026-09 Consistency Review**

**Motion** by Ms. Thomas, **seconded** by Mr. Murphy to approve the resolution as presented.

**Roll Call:**

**Aye:** Ms. Windrem, Mr. Gara, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Jayaraj, Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gussman

- **Redevelopment Plan Consistency Review Ordinance 2026-05, Planning Board Resolution 2026-11  
Station Village at Raritan LLC (Former Agway)  
77 Thompson St.  
Block 61 Lot 3.01**

Mr. Murphy discussed his concerns with the 10' side and rear yard and would like to see a 20' setback.

**Motion** by Mr. Murphy, **seconded** by Ms. Thomas to approve the resolution as presented with the addition of the setback concerns.

**Roll Call:**

**Aye:** Ms. Windrem, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Jayaraj, Ms. Thomas

**Nay:** None

**Abstain:** Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Gara, Mr. Brown, Mr. Gussman

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Mr. Cunningham, seconded by Mr. Murphy and unanimously carried to adjourn at 10:03.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Lou Gara, Board Administrator/Secretary

Approved: 4 / 32 / 2026

P-1 3/9/26  
[Signature]

2 [Signature]

Sam Timms  
1 La Grange Street  
2.1.2026

Look closely at the present that we're constructing, it should look like the future that we're dreaming. – Alice Walker

**Redevelopment Overview**

- Redevelopment plans are tools used by municipalities to advance public interest by facilitating redevelopment of unsafe or substandard property, when such redevelopment is unlikely to occur through private capital alone. **The power of municipalities to designate redevelopment areas and create redevelopment plans is an extension of a municipality's police power duties to protect the health, welfare, safety, and morals of the public.**
- **Building and site design in the Plan Area shall seek to minimize environmental damage, strain on municipal utilities and impact on adjacent uses.**
- By designating substandard properties as areas in need of redevelopment and creating redevelopment plans, municipalities gain access to additional legal and financial tools to incentivize the redevelopment of existing substandard properties **in accordance with the goals and objectives of the municipal master plan.**
- **Source** - Raritan Borough - Block 61, Lot 3.01(Former Agway Site) Redevelopment Plan
  - o 1.16.26
  - o Author – Joseph Brosnan - Engineer

**Key Callouts That Support Significant Changes to Agway Redevelopment Design - Proposal is not in alignment with the Master Plan**

**Land Use Rules as Defined in the Master Plan**

1. Provide a balanced land use pattern that preserves residential neighborhoods, strengthens the vitality of commercial districts, enhances remaining industrial areas, increases parks and open space, protects environmentally sensitive natural features, accommodates community facilities, encourages shared parking facilities among adjacent businesses, and facilitates local/regional circulation.

**Key Point - Agway Redevelopment Design is Not Supporting This. The design does not preserve residential neighborhoods, does not increase parks and open spaces, does not accommodate community facilities, does not provide sufficient parking, and does not facilitate local/regional circulation**

2. Preserve and enhance the residential character of the Borough by protecting established neighborhoods, maintaining a balance of housing choices, providing for compatible infill housing and planning for appropriate residential development in targeted redevelopment areas where land uses are in transition.

**Key Point - Agway Redevelopment Design is Not Supporting This.** It decreases the neighborhood residential feel lacking proper setbacks for existing homes, further decreasing water management, removes green space (trees), blocking sun from nearby properties, harming those residents' enjoyment of their properties. This is spot zoning, and it will be an island of extreme and arbitrary zoning in the middle of an ocean of R4.

3. Encourage appropriate redevelopment in transitional focus areas that will return underutilized land to productive use, improve quality of life, enhance community character, create new employment opportunities and strengthen the municipal tax base.

**Key Point - Agway Redevelopment Design is Not Fully Supporting This.** Though it may be returning underutilized land to productive use, in the current design it will not improve quality of life or enhance community character for neighbors in the community. There is no consideration for the negative impacts environmentally and to quality of life in an Overburdened Community per the New Jersey DEP definitions. The study to analyze the risks, impacts, and benefits of the redevelopment should be completed before a plan is voted on so that those are considered as part of the plan. In its current design, anyone can see that the design falls short of this and the design should be reduced significantly. Increasing setbacks to at minimum 25 feet from residential facing sides, and reducing height and units to a reasonable amount are two items to start with. As well, there is clearly insufficient parking for a development of this size, and arguments of shared parking or no cars are moot. Shared parking hasn't worked for the Valley Wellness development and in the absence of having a grocery store and other critical services, residents will need vehicle transport – Raritan is a food desert. The design as it stands is an environmental injustice to the residents of our community.

4. Continue the revitalization of the Central Business District as a mixed-use destination and support other commercial districts through selective redevelopment, compatible infill development, infrastructure improvements, updated zoning, public-private partnerships and increased regional cooperation.

**Key Point - Agway Redevelopment Design is Not Supporting This/Not Fully Applicable.** There is nothing in this design that "creates a corridor" from the train station to downtown.

5. Assess any proposed zoning changes against a build-out analysis to determine the impact of increasing or decreasing land use zones on adjacent zones, circulation, or the character of the neighborhood.

**Key Point - This has not been done to consider whether the plan being forth has a negative/positive impact. This should be done before voting for the adoption of a plan. The current design clearly negatively impacts me as a residential neighbor within 50 feet of the proposed building, with the narrow setback and height of the building impacting the enjoyment of property, most specifically the vegetable gardens in my backyard. Window to window wall distance in R5 zoning should be 75 feet. Anecdotally, there is risk to circulation as there are already backups of traffic daily to 202 on Thompson and on First Avenue, as well as multiple accidents yearly caused by traffic from Thompson onto La Grange Street.**

6. Provide increased parks, recreation and open space opportunities that will improve local quality of life, preserve established suburban character, protect existing natural resources and contribute to sustainable development. **Agway Redevelopment Design is Not Supporting This. The plan as designed is negatively impacting existing natural resources and providing no improvements. It increases the impervious coverage from 80% (already over the zoning requirement for R5 of 60%) to 95% and removes the only two trees on the side facing Thompson Street. This harms existing natural resources.**
7. Encourage the retention of existing industrial uses wherever feasible with an emphasis on industrial clusters found in the region such as pharmaceuticals, bio-medical research and life sciences. **Agway redevelopment does not support this as the unknown/unresearched impacts could negatively impact the retention of existing industrial uses.**
8. Coordinate land use planning and decision-making with adjacent municipalities in the Somerset County Regional Center to improve quality of life, preserve community character, preserve remaining natural resources, promote sustainable development and improve local/regional mobility. **Agway Redevelopment Design does not support this, impacting additional traffic into Highway 202, to the 202/22 interchange, and the Somerville circle potentially negative impacts neighboring communities in Somerville and Bridgewater. The community character currently is single family homes – a large development is out of character. What about senior homes/development with a community center? Increasing students in Raritan without corresponding resource support, risks burdening existing residents of Raritan and the Bridgewater/Raritan School District. JFK is a Title 1 school with more than 40 percent of students on free and reduced lunch, and is bursting at the seams. Recently, the teacher's lounge was**

**converted to a classroom and teachers now eat in the copy room – this is unacceptable from a community.**

**Source for Master Plan Information- Information directly from master plan document**  
[https://www.raritanboro.org/\\_Content/pdf/Master-Plan-Raritan.pdf](https://www.raritanboro.org/_Content/pdf/Master-Plan-Raritan.pdf)

**Key Discussion Point** - Design of Agway Redevelopment Plan is Egregiously Violating a number of defined zoning requirements in ways that are counter to the master plan. R5 is the highest density zoning standards that we have and the Agway design goes to extremes far beyond

Current R-5 Standards

<https://ecode360.com/13793979>

| <b>Part of Building</b>   | <b>Minimum Distance<br/>(feet)</b> |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Windowless wall to windowless wall                                    | 20                                 |
| Window wall to windowless wall  | 25                                 |
| Window wall to window wall:   |                                    |
| Front to front:   |                                    |
| Building height of up to 30 feet                                      | 50                                 |
| Building height of 30 feet or more                                    | 75                                 |
| Rear to rear  | 50                                 |
| End to end or end to rear   | 30                                 |
| Any building face to collector street curb                            | 40                                 |
| Any front building face to noncollector curb face or edge of pavement | 22                                 |
| Any side or rear building face to any noncollector street curb        | 18                                 |
| Any building face to common parking area, except garage               | 12                                 |
| Garage face to common parking area                                    | 5                                  |

**(8) Standards of Mixed Use Development from Master Plan – Raritan Greenway Riverfront:**

- (d) Maximum height: 3 1/2 stories/45 feet.
- (e) Maximum density: 22 units per acre.
- (f) Maximum impervious lot coverage: 60%.

**Source for Master Plan Information- Information directly from master plan document**  
[https://www.raritanboro.org/\\_Content/pdf/Master-Plan-Raritan.pdf](https://www.raritanboro.org/_Content/pdf/Master-Plan-Raritan.pdf)

**Metrics of Proposed Design for Agway Redevelopment**

| Proposed Bulk Schedule: Block 61, Lot 3.01 Redevelopment Plan Area   |          |
|--|----------|
| Description  | Required |
| Min. lot area (sq ft)  | 7,500    |
| Min. lot width (ft)  | 120      |
| Principal/Accessory bldg. front setback (ft)   | 5        |
| Principal/Accessory bldg. rear setback (ft)  | 10       |
| Principal/Accessory bldg. single side setback (ft)<br>* except as noted for the northerly side-yard line, refer to definition.   | 10*      |
| Max bldg. height (stories)   | 4        |
| Max bldg. height (ft)<br>*additional, non-habitable height is permitted for pitched/gabled roof, elevator penthouse, and related rooftop equipment, refer to definition. | 52*      |
| Total impervious coverage (%)  | 95       |

**Setbacks** - 5 and 10 feet are egregiously small/narrow. This impacts the “corridor” negatively and nearby properties, harming their owners from enjoying their properties (block sight, block sun, water runoff). These setbacks are not in accordance with existing requirements, nor comparable structures recently built and are solely in the interest of the developer, not our town or the residents. Setbacks that allow some green space, drainage, and care for neighboring properties are a must – Start at 40 feet to collector street curb, incorporate design green space and drainage, and then determine if setback can be reduced.

**Height** – Increasing the building height so significantly negatively impacts all neighboring residents within sight lines and is not in the character of the neighborhood. 2 or 3 stories maximum is a must.

**Impervious Coverage** – 95% percent is completely unacceptable (illegal) in an overburdened community that already has significant water management, flooding, and drainage problems. Disregarding this as part of the project, seriously violates the master plan and the responsibilities of planning board members to their constituents. As well, any water management/impervious coverage should be vetted against 2026 REAL (Resilient Environments and Landscapes) Rules.

**Window to Window Distance above 30 Feet** – The current design will be less than 50 feet from the windows of nearby residents

**Overburdened Community Designation – The Area that the Agway Redevelopment is located, is designated as an Overburdened Community**

- NJ’s landmark Environmental Justice Law requires DEP to evaluate environmental and public health impacts of certain facilities on overburdened

communities (OBCs) when reviewing certain applications. NJ is the first state required to issue denials for new facilities that cannot avoid disproportionate impacts on OBCs or serve compelling public interest. Regulations to implement the law are effective.

- Raritan from 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue to 206, and from the train tracks to the river is designated an overburdened community
  - o 35% low-income households
  - o 40% minority
  - o 40% non-English speaking



- NJ Environmental Justice Law – Quote - Ensure meaningful public participation in the Department’s analysis of environmental and public health stressors in overburdened communities and a facility’s contributions thereto;
- Environmental Concerns of Existing Design Which Must Be Discussed/Addressed
  - o Traffic
    - Currently ~60 resident addresses on Thompson Street – Somerset drive to 202. Building this as designed would more than double this
    - Congestion onto 202 already a problem (backups during high traffic times)

- Insufficient parking with commuters using street parking, snow ordinances with insufficient placement for vehicles, etc. Need to be addressed as part of plan before vote
    - Additional significant vehicles would contribute to our already poor air quality driven by congested streets and diesel locomotives
  - Water Management
    - Already flooding occurring in sewers in the area/drainage issues, impervious surfaces increased to 95% far above what is defined in zoning. Extensive water management and impact study needed to inform plan before vote.
  - Green Space
    - No addition of greenspace, and plan actually removes the only trees on that side of the road. Design must incorporate green space, green areas, plants in the plan, not only as a “recommendation”
  - Soil Quality
    - Agriculture Business – Fertilizers, Chemicals, etc. must be analyzed before voting on a plan. Remediation may be needed, and findings may impact what is possible.
    - Lead Analysis – Property built before lead regulations in effect. Need to understand risk and remediation need before voting
    - Current owner is using property for unapproved uses (landscaping storage – industrial) not as a landscaping business. Unsure of what was brought in, and of impact of owner vehicle causing downed powerline and vehicle fire. City has issued a violation
  - Light
    - Adding building that significantly exceeds height requirements, blocks sun from neighboring addresses (Vitamin D impact, negative impact to owner use – gardens)
  - Building Demolition Analysis
    - Recent demolitions (La Grange) have caused significant negative environmental impact and health impact for residents.
    - Analysis of building is needed( Asbestos, Particulates, Carcinogens, Lead) so that proper demolition and disposal can be included as part of redevelopment plan.
- Community Impact Concerns that Must Be Discussed/Addressed
  - School Impact – Risk of PILOT
  - Impact to tax base – **no cost/benefit analysis, enriching developer at the expense of our community**

- Traffic
- Air Quality
- Water Management
- Green Space
- Light/Shadow Impact

Sources - <https://dep.nj.gov/ej/communities/>  
[https://dep.nj.gov/wp-content/uploads/rules/rules/njac7\\_1c.pdf](https://dep.nj.gov/wp-content/uploads/rules/rules/njac7_1c.pdf)  
<https://dep.nj.gov/wp-content/uploads/ej/docs/raritan-borough-somerset-county-obc.pdf>

### **Commentary from Owner of Agway Property – Espos Article – Taking something Old and Rejuvenating it**

- **Understand the desire to support parking for Espos, plan can't be at the expense of residents**
- 3 Quotes from property owner of Agway/Associate with Espos
- "I hope there is more rejuvenation of older businesses," he said. "I think people should invest in Raritan — think local, shop local. New is great, but taking something old, rejuvenating it and making it your own is something even better."
- Sempervive, the financial backer of the project, said Espos is his first restaurant venture.
- "In the design process, we tried to keep as much of the old Espos with the renovation so when you walk in it doesn't feel like a brand new restaurant," Sempervive said
- **The Agway redevelopment is not in alignment with these statements of honoring heritage, rejuvenating what we have. Why?**
- <https://www.mycentraljersey.com/story/news/local/somerset-county/2019/08/29/espos-raritan-reopens-under-new-owners/2144542001/>

# With failure of postponement, I request the following amendments for the Master Plan

P-2 3/9/26  
1 page  
DHF

1. Modify the Agway Property to 9 affordable units and density within reasonable reach of highest current density property in Borough - Reasonable Redevelopment (6 required + 3 bonus units to match original 15%)
2. Remove Busky Property, not needed to achieve 22 unit threshold. Added at 11th hour without council involvement. Require environmental study before adding to affordable housing plan - property must be approvable, available, developable, suitable. This has not been proven with Busky.
3. Increase commitment for enabling circulation for a truly transit oriented district - build the sidewalk from Crossings at Raritan Station (13% vacancy rate), one way streets on Anderson/Thompson, Bike Lanes, and More. Without these commitments, we are adding cars into an overly congested area with no other transportation options
4. Modify this statement/remove it as this appears inaccurate, "It is understood that additional commercial uses can be woven into Thompson Street and Anderson Street" **What research was done to support this?**
5. Increase clarity of parking requirement - Must meet RSIS Standards, shared parking doesn't work/hasn't worked
6. Expand "Electric Vehicle Siting" section into broader green transit section - Bikes, Walking, e-Bikes, alternative forms of transportation
7. Include update related to the use of PILOT programs within our Borough. This should include requirements of cost/benefit analysis, ensure calculations are based on total revenues/accurate construction costs tied to the property, and establish clarity for how PILOT will be managed for ongoing accuracy



Ryne Timms &lt;rstimms@gmail.com&gt;

## Information for Your Review - Concerns with Agway Redevelopment In Advance of Tuesday Council Meeting

Ryne Timms &lt;rstimms@gmail.com&gt;

Sun, Feb 1, 2026 at 5:29 PM

To: dtozzi@raritan-nj.org, gharwood@raritan-nj.org, dfritzinger@raritan-nj.org, kdigraziano@raritan-nj.org, uagrawal@raritan-nj.org

Good evening Mayor Tozzi and Council Members,

Please find attached the documentation I compiled for a robust discussion and consideration related to Agway Redevelopment. As a homeowner living directly across Thompson from the Redevelopment Site at 1 La Grange Street, I continue to have **serious concerns** about continuing to explore a 4 story building on the site, as **the traits of the redesigned property highly benefit the developer and are not in the interest/risk significantly harming our community and its residents.**

Please review the documents and bring your own data, insights, and recommendations related to the redevelopment to Tuesday's meeting. As a community, I believe we can use Tuesday's meeting to discuss potential design changes. The engineer can then revise the design and bring back a redesign (or potentially multiple designs) for consideration and vote at a future meeting. (I will be making my recommendations during comment).

I also recommend tabling any vote Tuesday related to the redevelopment or making the votes 'no' until we get a design that the community agrees upon. If the current design is approved, our ability to change or modify it later will be significantly limited (potentially eliminated, based on precedent of previous redevelopments).

**I am for redevelopment of the property as long as it is in the benefit and interests of our community.**

**The current design is in the interest of the developer and harmful to our community.**

Your interests and responsibilities as council members/the mayor are for your constituents and the community that you serve, not for the interests of the developer.

Thank you for your consideration. As well, if one of you could forward these materials to Councilman Giraldi and the new council member being sworn in so they can review in advance of the meeting it would be much appreciated.

Respectfully,  
Sam Timms  
1 La Grange Street

 **Document for Council Meeting - Agway Redevelopment - Sam Timms.pdf**  
4608K