

BOROUGH OF RARITAN
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES
April 10, 2018

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. in the Raritan Municipal Building and clarified that the purpose of the meeting would be to answer technical questions regarding process and not to provide any legal interpretations.

Present: Rick Miller
Debbie Thomas
Mike DeCicco
Stan Schrek, Board Engineer

Also Present: Larry Bravman, Attorney for Raritan Johnson Associates LLC (Owner of 1,2,5 and 10 Johnson Drive)
Randy Brightman, representative of Raritan Johnson Associates LLC

Mr. Bravman explained that the purpose of the meeting was in order to gain a better understanding of what was required in order to obtain a CO for a new business. He provided an overview of the subject property which he explained, consists of 249,000 square feet spread out within four separate buildings, all leased to small businesses [with the exception of LabCorp] operating permitted uses.

Mr. Bravman explained that over the years, they had always been granted CO's for their tenants via administrative review until recently when they presented an application for a ping pong facility which they were told would require Board approval. He offered that they wanted to gain a better understanding of what was required in order to continue to bring good businesses into the Borough.

Mr. Brightman offered that quick turnover/efficiency is key since prospective tenants are often under time restraints and also because renting space is not their primary business. Mr. Bravman concurred, offering that they need guidelines in order to continue to contribute to the community by bringing in good tenants.

Mr. Miller offered that they would need to talk about what the guidelines are in order to encourage business development with the understanding that they want to make it easy to rent space in a timely manner. Mr. Schrek explained that this has been an ongoing discussion which the Board Attorney had to conflict out of. He offered the Panera shopping center as an example of a place that has site plan approval which is subject to certain requirements. He related that certain Site Plan requirements such as parking, hours of operation, lighting and ADA requirements can have an impact on whether a use can be approved administratively. In the case of the ping pong facility, Mr. Schrek offered that safety issues for children coming to the facility could be an issue given the proximity to the Glacier Ice business for example, because of their trucks. With respect to Site Plan, he offered that they could come in with a drawing of the buildings as they exist and provide rough idea of architectural details as well as ADA spaces. He explained that for occupancy changes Lou [Gara] would review any permitted uses administratively.

Mr. Brightman and Mr. Bravman provided a copy of a site plan which was discussed. Further discussion ensued as to whether it was more commercial or industrial. Mr. Schrek offered that the private road could be a concern. They reviewed the Labcorp building and entry points. Mr. Bravman outlined the uses on the site. Mr. Brightman identified the sites that they would like to lease.

There was a brief discussion about a problem at Somerset Wood with a scrubber which Mr. Brightman indicated was already being addressed.

Ms. Thomas offered that impacts to the neighborhood are often a reason why matters have to come before the Board. Mr. Brightman reiterated that efforts were being made to bring in quality tenants with businesses that would have little impact on the neighborhood. Mr. Schrek acknowledged their efforts and Ms. Thomas added that they need to keep everyone happy.

Mr. Bravman explained that the Site Plan they presented was for the generator which was the subject of a Board application so it mainly showed detail for that building. Mr. Schrek offered that they could come back for a one time review showing everything for each building including parking, entrances, lighting, etc. Mr. Brightman offered that it was a lost cause since they lost the ping pong facility that was not able to pursue the lease as a non-permitted use for financial reasons. Mr. Schrek explained the need to protect the public and understand business overlap, etc. He explained that the Board would have simple questions and that it would not be a full blown site plan at which point they could then go for building permits.

Mr. Bravman indicated that this was the first prospective tenant that was impacted. Mr. Schrek explained that the Ordinance says the Construction Official can refer anything back to the Board.

Mr. Brightman offered that they just want to make sure things are reasonably and practicably done.

The meeting ended at 9:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Probst, Planning Board Secretary

APPROVED _____