

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

The Regular Meeting of the Piscataway Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 P.M. on WebEx (online), Piscataway, New Jersey by Chairperson Smith.

Chairperson Smith stated: IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT, ADEQUATE NOTICE OF THIS MEETING WAS PROVIDED IN THE FOLLOWING WAYS:

- \*Posted on the bulletin board of the Municipal Building and made available through the Township Clerk;
- \*Notice published in the Courier News;
- \*Notice sent to The Star Ledger;
- \*Notice made available through the Township Librarians.

**ROLL CALL:** Mayor Wahler, Councilwoman Cahill, Dawn Corcoran-Gardella, Rev. Henry Kenney, Carol Saunders, Dennis Espinosa and Chairperson Brenda Smith.

**ABSENT:** Paul Carlton, Michael Foster

**Also present:** Thomas Barlow, Esq., Steven Gottlieb, Laura Buckley

It was determined that a quorum was present by roll call.

Thomas Barlow, Esq., states that he would like to place on the record that we are doing this meeting through an online meeting platform in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. In keeping with the guidelines that have been disseminated by the Department of Community Affairs, the Planning Board has tried it's best to comply with the open public meeting act and the Governor's guidelines in dealing with the current situation. In addition, the applicant whose matter will be heard this evening had the login information for the online meeting platform put forth in their notice; members of the public who wish to be heard will be afforded an opportunity as if we were in an actual, physical space. He believes we have done our absolute best to comply with the DCA guidelines and the open public meetings act.

**4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**5. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS: Steven Gottlieb, CME**

**6. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION TO MEMORIALIZE ACTION TAKEN ON JULY 8, 2020:**

- (a) **20-PB-01 New York SMSA Limited Partnership d/b/a/ Verizon Wireless Preliminary & Final Site Plan Block 1016, Lot 2; Zone M-1 600 Prospect Avenue**  
Application was approved.

**MOTION** was made by Ms. Saunders to adopt the resolution; seconded by Rev. Kenney.

**ROLL CALL:** Mayor Wahler, Councilwoman Cahill, Rev. Kenney, Carol Saunders, Dawn Corcoran-Gardella, Dennis Espinosa and Chairperson Smith voted yes on the motion.

**7. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES FROM THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 8, 2020.**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

**MOTION** was made by Ms. Saunders to adopt the minutes of July 8, 2020; seconded by Rev. Kenney. **ROLL CALL:** Mayor Wahler, Councilwoman Cahill, Rev. Kenney, Carol Saunders, Dawn Corcoran-Gardella and Chairperson Smith voted yes on the motion.

**8. COURTESY REVIEW: BOARD OF EDUCATION. They propose the construction of a new LED message sign for the Piscataway Campus of the Middlesex County Vocational & Technical School located at 21 Suttons Lane.**

Beth Kenderdine, Edwards Engineering Group, is sworn in to testify. Her firm has prepared the plans for the Board of Education that was submitted showing the location of the sign. She has Adam Finkle from SSP Architects with her for the application. Ms. Kenderdine puts the plan that was submitted on the screen; she states that it is the Middlesex County Piscataway Campus Vocational School on Suttons Lane. She shows the parking lot and the main entrance closest to the building; the Board of Education would like to put a message sign right near the entrance driveway off of Suttons Lane.

Ms. Kenderdine states that they have an approximate limit of the right-of-way based on an old survey and they would like to place the sign 20 feet off of the existing curb to make sure they are outside the existing right-of way. The new LED sign that is going to be proposed is up in the right hand corner of the plan. The sign will be 8' to 8 ¾' wide and 8' 2" in height with LED on the front. The sign is almost exactly what has been constructed on the other two Voc-tech Campuses in East Brunswick and Woodbridge. She has pictures of both signs from the other campuses and shows them to the Board.

They are essentially coming in front of the Board for a Capital Review to show the Board what they are doing. Dawn Corcoran states that there are plans to install sidewalks along Suttons Lane frontage, there will be a 5' sidewalk along the frontage. Ms. Kenderdine states that there is 18 feet so there should be room. The sign will be illuminated on both sides.

Adam Finkle, SSP Architects, is sworn in to testify. Mr. Finkle states that the School District in conformance with their other campuses will use the sign to maintain their school logo, date, time and temperature. They will also use the sign for school events and accommodations; it will not be used for any advertisement. The LED sign will be continuously used over the calendar year. Public portion open/closed. The Board is in favor of the courtesy application.

**SITE PLAN**

- 9. 19-PB-34 17 Plainfield Avenue, LLC**  
**19-PB-35V Preliminary & Final Site Plan, Bulk Variance**  
**Block 6809, Lot 6, Zone: C**  
**17 Plainfield Avenue**  
Applicant would like to construct a second story addition.

**10. DISCUSSION: Minor Subdivision, Application # 79-PB-43. Property known as 30 Rachel Terrace, Block 8504, Lot 41. They would like an extension of time for filing the subdivision deed for a period of thirty (30) days.**

Mr. Barlow states that he would like to briefly address this for the Board. There was a March 19, 2020 letter from Robert Williams who is the owner of the property at 30 Rachel Terrace. They were before the Planning Board in 1979, that is why there is an application number of 79-PB-43. At that point the Planning Board granted a minor subdivision; deeds were prepared, the Board approved the resolution

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

and appropriate documents were signed off by the Planning Board Chairman and Secretary. However, it appears that the subdivision deed itself was signed but it was never filed. As part of a title search, the owner realized that he has a deed but it was never filed. He wrote a letter to the Board to ask for an additional 30 day extension of time to allow him to file the deed. Mr. Barlow states that all of the paperwork is in order, it's actually just a house keeping item. If the owner just sent the deed to the County now, it's going to get kicked back. He needs a resolution from the Board granting him an extension to file it. He asked for 30 days, but I believe we should give him a 60 day extension if the Board feels inclined, so he can file the deed. Chairperson Smith agrees.

Mr. Barlow asks the Board if they would like to make a motion to grant the 60 day extension so Mr. Williams can file with the County. Mr. Gottlieb asks Mr. Barlow if he is comfortable with this. Mr. Barlow states that he spoke to the applicant's representatives and he understands what happened, so he is very comfortable with it. All of the paperwork was all in order, it was just not mailed in.

**MOTION** was made by Rev. Henry Kenney to approve the extension of time; seconded by Ms. Saunders. **ROLL CALL:** Mayor Wahler, Councilwoman Cahill, Rev. Kenney, Carol Saunders, Dawn Corcoran-Gardella, Dennis Espinosa and Chairperson Smith voted yes on the motion.

**11. DISCUSSION: TO DETERMINE IF BLOCK 4102, LOT 2, BEING COMMONLY KNOWN AS 141 CIRCLE DRIVE NORTH, MEETS THE CRITERIA AS A NON-CONDEMNATION AREA IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT.**

James F. Clarkin, IV, Planner, is sworn in to testify. Mr. Clarkin states that this study before them tonight is for an area in need of redevelopment study for block 4102, lot 2, also known as 141 Circle Drive North in Piscataway Township. Piscataway Township Council asked for this area to be studied as a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment. He was retained by the Board and has prepared the study in front of them. Mr. Clarkin states that he did an on-site investigation on the property on March 13, 2020 and as with most area in need studies, he looked at Township records, aerials, tax information, the Master Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. He also takes photos of the areas when he does his on-site investigations.

Mr. Clarkin states that on page 5 it states the current conditions on the site. It is about 5.6 acres in size, located on Circle Drive North near the intersection of Possumtown Road. In the back of the report there is an aerial photo of the property. In the white square is the study area and he points out the intersection. South east on Possumtown Road you will hit 287, exit 8. The property is vacant forest and land with some potential wetlands on the property. He cross referenced Piscataway Township's building and zoning records and could not find any evidence of there being any development; it's been like this for over 10 years.

Mr. Clarkin states he does an environmental analysis of the study area. There are several colors on the exhibit; the light blue are wetlands, the pink is ground water contamination and there are two little stars which means it is a known contaminated site. These are all DEP records that are online; it states that the entire property was wet. When he walked the property that was not the case; he did find some evidence of standing water and some pink wetlands flags more into the rear of the property. He walked at least half way before he came upon any evidence of wetlands. It does seem that at some point there was a brook that ran through there but he did not see any running water that would indicate a stream.

Surrounding land uses, this is an LI-5 light industrial district. It is industrial with warehouses and some light manufacturing. Mr. Clarkin points to a big structure on the map which is a large data center.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

If you go further south on Possumtown Road there is Possumtown Park. Further north beyond the properties there are some residential areas; there are also some residential areas in the southern side. Mr. Clarkin states that on page 7 it goes through the requirements for the LI-5 zone. As far as the Master Plan prospective, he states that the plan does not specifically call out this property for being in need of redevelopment. In the Master Plan it does state that “Redevelopment activity will become an increasingly important land use issue, especially within the older developed sections of the Township”. He believes that this area, Circle Drive North, is an older area of the Township that hasn’t seen much development. Mr. Clarkin states this Master Plan assumption is consistent with promoting redevelopment activity at the study area and meets the Master Plan land use goals and policy statement.

In reference to the State Planning Area Classification, the plan classifies all of Piscataway Township as Planning Area 1 (PA-1) which is known as the Metropolitan Planning Area. It also lists Piscataway Township as a smart growth area in general. Overall, the PA-1 area calls for the development and the redevelopment of the states to occur in those areas. Therefore, redevelopment at this site would be consistent with PA-1 state planning classification and he believes the smart growth intentions of that plan.

Mr. Clarkin goes through the pictures; mostly forest area where you can see some debris but not much, mostly near the road side. There is some evidence of wetlands that he mentioned earlier. When he looked at the DEP records, he couldn’t find when it was demarcated, so he doesn’t know how old those are. The flags seemed scattered around a bit so they have been there for some time; they were at different areas of the study area. The second picture, if you look further back, you can see some evidence of water on the property towards Possumtown Road. Mr. Clarkin states that he is a Professional Planner and does not have the license to demarcate wetlands or to say for sure that they do exist; he is going by what he sees in the photos.

He believes that it will be important if they move forward in the redevelopment process that they demark the wetlands as it can have some impact as to what can be developed there. He believes there is substantial evidence that they meets the the “C” criteria. The “C” criteria is land that is owned by the municipality, the county, a local housing authority, redevelopment agency or redevelopment entity, or unimproved vacant land that has remained so far for a period of ten years prior to adoption of the resolution, and that by portions of the municipality, or topography, or nature of the soil, is not likely to be developed through the instrumentality of private capital.

Mr. Clarkin states that so as he has said, he has already showed evidence that the property has been vacant over ten (10) years and will not likely be developed through private capital. If you are a private developer, and you are doing their diligence, you find this information you can assume that it is entirely wetlands and most likely not developable. If you find that the wetlands are not as extensive but that they are still present, it is enough to deter private capital because as you know, if there is a certain amount of wetlands on any property you will have to go through NJDEP regulations. That would add many expenses to the project; hiring professionals, demarcating wetlands, etc. The wet nature of the soil is a deterrent for private capital.

In addition, the pink areas on the map are ground water contamination. The largest area in pink is large enough where it has an active groundwater pumping system to make sure that the contamination does not spread. The two areas on lot 41.04 and lot 3 and 4, have no records of any ground water pumping but it did say that Dow Chemical did own it at one point. If ground water contamination was to escape it would be in the direction of the study area. So the potential for ground water contamination is enough for another deterrent for private capital to develop it on it’s own without public assistance.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

The combination of those two items, the soil and the ground water contamination, are in his professional opinion, deterrents for private capital. In his professional opinion, he concludes that the study area meets the “C” criteria and the long term vacancy and stagnation is detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

The second criteria that he applied is the “H” criteria. It states that the designation of the delineated area is consistent with the smart growth planning principles adopted pursuant to law or regulation. As per what the State Planning Office has put together, Piscataway Township is listed as a smart growth area. The State sees Piscataway Township as smart growth already, but specifically for this site, interstate 287 is close by, there are lots of existing light industrial development on Circle Drive North where you take advantage of water and sewer, which means you don’t have to add an expense for that. It is his opinion that it also meets the “H” criteria for being close by the existing infrastructure and meeting the smart growth principles.

In conclusion, he recommends that this Piscataway Township Planning Board and the Council determine that the study area Block 4102, Lot 2, is an area in need of redevelopment based on the fact that it meets the criteria “C” and “H” of the New Jersey Redevelopment and Housing Law. Currently the site presents an opportunity to be redeveloped in a smart way and he believes that moving forward with the process would increase economic vitality of not only the study area but for the Township as well.

Steven Gottlieb states that he concurs with Mr. Clarkin, he just would like to point out that his assessment of the wetlands is accurate in the fact that a lot of times the DEP map is misleading. If the Board recalls, they approved a warehouse on the adjoining property on lot 1 where it did have some wetlands on it but they were able to find enough area to construct a warehouse with associated parking.

Councilwoman Cahill asks if this is the first time we are seeing the plans and the report. The report was emailed to all of the Board members prior to the hearing. She would like some clarity, in reference to the land being non-condemnation but also not desirable to private capital without public assistance. Mr. Clarkin states that if a developer is looking at this property and doing his due diligence, he might come across the fact that DEP thinks the entire area is wetlands and usually when a developer sees that it is large, it can cause development issues and either reduce the value and what can be accommodated on the site. Also, just the fact that the wetlands are there can be a big deterrent. If you fill in wetlands, you have to find somewhere in the state to add more wetlands and that become a large cost to the developer.

Chairperson Smith opens it to Board. Mr. Espinosa asks from an environmental perspective, any reason to preserve the wetlands in Piscataway. Mr. Clarkin states that if they are significant enough. That is where the developer comes in and has to really get an expert out there and see what value the wetlands are. The DEP has 3 or 4 categories for wetlands ranging from significant, meaning that they are very high in environmental values; wildlife habitats, etc. If it is small enough they can either fill them or they can pay DEP to put them somewhere else.

Chairperson Smith asks if Mr. Clarkin knows if the other two lots are going to be developed as well. Mr. Clarkin states that this study is strictly for this property and is unaware of any other development is going on with the two adjoining lots. He believes one of the lots got approval last year but not sure about the other one. Mayor Wahler states that if the Board decides to make this a redevelopment site, the owner/application is going to have the hurdle with the DEP to come up with a plan and would then come back to the Board anyway for approval. If they don’t get passed DEP it is a mute point. Public portion open/closed.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

**MOTION** was made by Rev. Henry Kenney to approve Block 4102, Lot 2 meets the criteria as a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment; seconded by Ms. Corcoran. **ROLL CALL:** Mayor Wahler, Councilwoman Cahill, Rev. Kenney, Carol Saunders, Dawn Corcoran-Gardella, Dennis Espinosa and Chairperson Smith voted yes on the motion.

**12. DISCUSSION: TO DETERMINE IF BLOCK 5101, LOTS 5.02, 6.02, 7.02, BEING COMMONLY KNOWN AS SOUTH WASHINGTON AVENUE AND ACCESS ROAD, MEETS THE CRITERIA AS A NON-CONDEMNATION AREA IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT.**

James F. Clarkin, Planner, is sworn in to testify. He was retained by the Board after Piscataway Township Council asked the Board to study this area for in need of redevelopment. This one is a little longer considering it has three (3) lots. On March 11<sup>th</sup> and June 30<sup>th</sup> of this year, he did an on-site inspection to photograph and then he compares them with Township records, aerials, Master Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

He states that this is for Block 5101, Lots 5.02, 6.02 and 7.02 also known as S. Washington Avenue and Centennial Avenue. These three continuous properties represent about 21.4 acres of land and is coming in that northwest corner of this intersection and bound by Access Road. Lot 5.02 has dual frontage on Access Road and Centennial Avenue. It is mainly open space with a gravel portion. Mayor Wahler states that it is the Avis Rental site that they are discussing. Mr. Clarkin states that for Lot 5.02 and the gravel area is used for the businesses that are there. There is a stretch of forest, trees and dense vegetation on the property that wraps around the boarder. This is vacant, unimproved land and has been like that for over ten (10) years.

Mr. Clarkin states that lot 6.02 is known as the Avis Rental site; there are actually two businesses on the property. The second building is actually CLC, Contract Leasing Corporation, they lease trailers. On the map, you can see how they split up their daily operations with the leasing and the car rental parking. The trailer storage is really on the southern end of the lot and not near the offices. Both the buildings are two story, brick buildings. The first has the rental car offices and a repair facility with three or four garages. For the other building there are offices and the remainder are trailer bays for maintenance as well with an attic for storage. Besides the two businesses and the two buildings, it is really just one giant parking lot/storage area. The pavement is there and then turns to gravel.

Lot 7.02 is like a corner through lot from Access Road. It is unimproved land with tall grass, woods, forests and trees and some potential wetlands. Lot 5.02 is 7.91 acres, Lot 6.02 is 9.36 acres and Lot 7.02 is 4.1 acres for over 21 acres in size.

Mr. Clarkin states that the environmental analysis research, two things came up; wetlands and underground storage tanks. For the underground storage tanks, the rental car facility has to put gas in it's vehicles and it has a fueling station in the middle of the property. When he looked at DEP records there was not anything out of order; they were permitted and allowed. Mr. Clarkin shares a map of the wetlands. He states that he walked the site and did not see wetlands in the area. There was a dry stream bed running through the vegetation; he went back after a heavy rain but still did not see any running water. He did not see any standing or running water on the site. There was a fence on the property and could not get all the way back so that would be something that they would have to look into. The DEP map has wetlands going all the way through, there are no wetlands on the driveway but there is standing water in some areas. He did find some demarcation flags as well, but again, he couldn't get all the back on the property. They would need an expert to go out and see where the wetlands actually are.

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

Mr. Clarkin states that the surrounding land uses, there are two residential homes near the property. A warehouse development was recently developed near by and if you go further west, you will come in contact with Corporate Place where there are other warehouses and light industrial uses. Across the way on Centennial Avenue there is a small office building, Interstate 287 (exit 6) and more light industrial, retail and other commercial uses. To the east there is Piscataway shopping center with retail use; big box stores. All three (3) lots are in the LI-5 light industrial zone and permits a variety of light industrial uses, light manufacturing, etc.

For the Master Plan perspective, the plan does not call out for this area for being studied for an area of redevelopment. But once again, the fact that the Master Plan does mention that redevelopment activity becomes important for older sections of the Township he believes qualifies this area to be studied today. In reference to the State Planning Area Classification, the plan classifies all of Piscataway Township as Planning Area 1 (PA-1) which is known as the Metropolitan Planning Area. It also lists Piscataway Township as a smart growth area in general. Overall, the PA-1 area calls for the development and the redevelopment of the states to occur in those areas. Therefore, redevelopment at this site would be consistent with PA-1 state planning classification and he believes the smart growth intensions of that plan.

Mr. Clarkin states that in reference to lot 5.02, which is the one furthest to the left on the aerial, it is all open space looking north towards 287 and Access Road. Looking south you can kind of get an idea with the vegetation and almost cuts the property in half. He discusses more of the pictures. On the tax map you can see the ditch or basin that is there which is where the drainage goes to but then you have a slope that covers the access to Centennial Avenue. It would just be a possible continuation of the drainage as the water once again goes in a north directions. He did a search for Police and Township records also. There was some little dumping on the property for Lot 5.02.

He shows a map of the middle Lot, 6.02, you can see the extent of how many cars are on the property. Also, the condition of the pavement; it is really dilapidated and can show lack of maintenance. The gravel area has large potholes and gets worse and you go down the property. As far the buildings are concerned, it's really just the maintenance facility, offices and the attic space which seem to be in decent shape. Mr. Clarkin has pictures of the parking lot after a heavy rain, which shows the water and the holes in the area on the lot. There is haphazard parking for the rentals cars and trailers; it really is obsolete. There is a more modern and safer approach to storing rental cars and trailers so there are no hazards and taking up so much space.

Police records for Lot 6.02 were quite extensive. Appendix C in his report has a full list of all of the Police records. Between 2010 and 2020 there were 36 incidents of stolen vehicles and/or trailers on the property. Most of them were for the stolen vehicles, but some of them involved stolen trailers. Other Police reports on the property were for disorderly conduct, burglary, forgery, dumping, possession of drugs and fraudulent business checks. The lack of security on the property unfortunately makes it an attraction for crime especially once the businesses close for the night. The lack of modern storage for the vehicles and trailers, the lighting, really makes it dangerous, obsolete and a detriment to the community.

Mr. Clarkin states that in reference to Lot 7.02, he did not find any records of anything ever being developed; it is just grasslands and forest. He does want to note the very high grade change and wall where Access Road meets South Washington Avenue. There were some pink flags on the site which mean wetlands. The DEP records show that a large portion of the lot is covered in wetlands but they would need a professional to be sure of the extent of the wetlands.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

Mr. Clarkin states that he would like to discuss improvement value to land value ratio in section 5.1 of his report. This tool looks at economic productivity in the study area. This is done by analyzing the tax assessment data that he researches from the Township's Tax Office. There is a table that shows the values in the report on page 21. Lots 5.02 and 7.02 have no improvement value which means they are being underutilized. Lot 6.02 improvement to land ratio is only 0.17:1 so you can really see the difference between the improvement value and the land value. The land is more valuable than the improvements upon it; the low ratio of 0.17:1 means that it is being underutilized.

Mr. Clarkin looked at three other properties next to the study area; lots 2, 4.02 and Block 5701 Lot 7.03. He had to go further west of the study area so it is actually the one at Corporate Place and Centennial Avenue. He chose this one because the lot right next to the study area is the PSE&G facility which would not be a good comparison. The second one is the brand new warehouse development on Access Road right next to the study area. The third is the office building across the street on Centennial Avenue. The land and improvement to land ratio is much higher than the study site. The other areas are thriving while the study area is not and being economically underutilized.

The application of the criteria; Lot 5.02. As per the study, there could be wetlands in the area which would deter private capital, so that is one deterrent. The other is the fact that there is a drainage and slope easement on the one side which could create difficulties for access. Physical evidence of long term vacancy combined with the natural features found on Lot 5.02 meets the "C" criteria and feels that in his professional opinion it meets the "C" criteria in long term vacancy and is detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

He applied section three (3) of the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law.

A redevelopment area may include lands, buildings or improvements which in themselves are not detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare but the inclusion of which is found necessary with or without changing their condition for the affective redevelopment area. He finds that section three applies to Lot 5.02; it is necessary for the redevelopment of the entire area to make the project more developable. Also, it connects to Lots 6.02 and 7.02 which would give more access options to Centennial Avenue which would make the property more economically viable.

Mr. Clarkin states that Block 5101, Lot 6.02 he found that the "D" criteria applies to this lot. Areas with buildings or improvements which, by reason of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, lights and sanitary facilities, excessive land coverage, delirious land use or obsolete layout, or any combination of these or other factors are detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the community. The dilapidation and lack of the parking lot is very clear from the photos and from his site visit. The obsolescence of the haphazard parking and stuffing of trailers onto the large parking area, faulty arrangement and lack of design to even store the trailers and cars. The excessive land coverage all along and he believes the dilapidated parking area creates an eye sore.

The potholes are starting to damage the vehicles and trucks that are going through there as they are entering the property and could add personal injury. There has been a number of Police incidents on this property over the last ten years and it's just has created this kind of social behavior and it constitutes deleterious land use and is detrimental to the welfare of the community. Mr. Clarkin believes that a redevelopment can turn that around for this site.



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

Mr. Clarkin states that overall the physical and documented evidence confirm the presence of conditions that exhibit obsolescence, excessive land coverage, deleterious land use and dilapidation of the site. These conditions and factors are a detriment to the safety, health and morals to the community, in his opinion.

According to the DEP, Lot 7.02, it shows extensive wetlands on the property and he also found some evidence as well and feels that it is a deterrent to private capital for similar reasons; permits, professionals, added expense, etc. The nature of the soil and the natural feature is one deterrent but also he pointed out in the photo the high brick wall showing the grade change; he pointed that out for the point of access. He believes accessing the property would be very difficult and also difficult to get that road to connect to Access Road at that high grade because there is not a lot of frontage on that lot to allow for a road to connect. If you were to put a direct access on to South Washington Avenue he believes it would cause a lot of problems; there are three signalized intersections between 287 and Centennial Avenue. That would be a deterrent to private capital as well.

Mr. Clarkin has also applied section three (3) to Lot 7.02 as well for similar reasons it will provide additional land area to provide a more developable project within the study area. That added land area will connect Lots 5.02 and 6.02 which will give more access options especially around the intersection. For all three lots he has applied the "H" criteria as this is in the Planning Area 1 of the State Plan and Piscataway Township is already marked as a smart growth area. Also with the proximately of 287 and the surrounding infrastructure that is already there, he believes that it meets the smart growth objections of the State Plan for all three lots.

In conclusion, he recommends that the Piscataway Township Planning Board and the Township Council determine that the study area is a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment based on the fact that it meets the criteria of the New Jersey Local Redevelopment and Housing Law. Block 5101, Lot 5.02 meets the C, H and section 3 criteria of the Law. Block 5101, Lot 6.02 meets the D and E criteria of the Law and Block 5101, Lot 7.02 meets the C, H and section 3 criteria of the Law. He feels it is a great opportunity for redevelopment to take advantage of the surrounding infrastructure to develop in a smart way, it meets the Master Plan goals and the criteria set forth in the redevelopment law.

Rev. Henry Kenney asks if all three lots will be combined for redevelopment together; Mr. Clarkin says yes they could. That is what falls under the section 3 of the criteria. Rev. Kenney states that it would be better for development once they are merged. Steven Gottlieb states that he concurs with Mr. Clarkin with the wetlands and environmental issues. Since all three parcels are under separate ownership, the inclusion of all three in the redevelopment area could eventually entice a developer to buy all three properties.

Public portion open: Ken Simmons, 113 Willow Avenue, Piscataway, NJ. He would like to know if the Township owns any of the properties or will be buying any of the properties. Mr. Clarkin states that the Township does not own any of the lots. A developer may come forward to purchase all of the lots; typically it is one developer but can be multiple. If that does come to pass, then they would move to the redevelopment stage and that is when the Township will work with the developer to figure out what to put on the property. To his knowledge, they are not currently for sale. Public portion closed.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON AUGUST 12, 2020.**

**MOTION** was made by Rev. Henry Kenney to approve Block 5101, Lots 5.02, 6.02 and 7.02 meets the criteria as a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment; seconded by Ms. Saunders. **ROLL CALL:** Mayor Wahler, Councilwoman Cahill, Rev. Kenney, Carol Saunders, Dawn Corcoran-Gardella, Dennis Espinosa and Chairperson Smith voted yes on the motion.

**SITE PLAN**

**POSTPONED UNTIL SEPT. 9, 2020**

**13. 20-PB-04**

**Piscataway Centennial Developers, LLC  
Preliminary and Final Site Plan  
Block 6703, Lot 6; Zone: Redevelopment  
88 Centennial Avenue & River Road**

**14. DULY AUDITED BILLS TO BE PAID**

**MOTION** was made by Rev. Henry Kenney to pay the bills and seconded by Ms. Saunders. **ROLL CALL:** Mayor Wahler, Councilwoman Cahill, Rev. Kenney, Carol Saunders, Dawn Corcoran-Gardella, Dennis Espinosa and Chairperson Smith voted yes on the motion.

**15. ADJOURNMENT: MOTION** made by Councilwoman Cahill to adjourn; All in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 P.M.

**NEXT SITE PB/WORKSHOP BOARD MEETING – AUG. 26, 2020 AT 2:30 P.M.  
NEXT PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING – SEPTEMBER 9, 2020 AT 7:30 P.M.**

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Laura A. Buckley  
Planning Board Clerk for Carol A. Saunders, Secretary

**I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 12, 2020, same having been fully adopted by the Planning Board of Piscataway on September 9, 2020.**

---

CAROL A. SAUNDERS, Secretary  
PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD