

## SITE PLAN REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD

### NOTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 9, 2014

### PRINCETON MUNICIPAL BUILDING

Meeting Room A –7:30 P.M.

Princeton, New Jersey

PRESENT: Alyce Bush, Robert Cerutti, Harry Cooke, Dana Molina, Holly Nelson, Pamela Rew, Lydia Robinson, William Wolfe

ABSENT: James Begin

ALSO PRESENT: Jack West, Land Use Engineer; Kerry A. Philip, Secretary

Chairman Wolfe called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. reading the Opening Statement as required by the Open Public Meetings Act, acknowledging that notice of this meeting was issued on the 5th day of December, 2013.

#### REORGANIZATION

- a) Nomination and Election of Chairman – Motion was made by Mr. Cooke and Ms. Bush seconded the motion to elect William Wolfe as Chairman for 2014. The vote was 7-0 in favor. Motion carried.
- b) Nomination and Election of Vice-Chairman - Motion was made by Mr. Cooke and Mr. Wolfe seconded the motion to elect Robert Cerutti as Vice-Chairman for 2014. The vote was 7-0 in favor. Motion carried.

#### MINUTES

- a) November 13, 2013 – postponed to next meeting
- b) December 11, 2013 - postponed to next meeting

#### APPLICATIONS

- a) All Saints' Church  
Minor Site Plan w/conditional use  
16 All Saints Road  
Block 4401, Lot 3.01  
File #P1313-066P  
MLUL Deadline: 6/6/14

Daniel Haggerty, Esq., legal counsel for the applicant, stated that a 1,147 SF addition is proposed to be constructed. This is the only part of the building that needs renovation. A solid white wall exists where the addition is proposed. The applicant is proposing an expansion of the sanctuary, the purpose of the expansion on the east side of the church is for more interior space for the choir and additional storage space in the basement.

Michael Farewell, architect for the applicant, stated that the proposal is a modest addition to the building. The addition will provide good site lines and great acoustics in the sanctuary. Stone walls are proposed for the addition which will be similar to the stone façade of the existing

building. The glass windows are proposed for transparency and they will replicate some of the other features of the church. The addition will not be visible from the roadway and additional Maple and Oak trees are proposed to buffer the view of the addition from the All Saints' Road. Wood truss roofing is proposed as per code requirements with a steel frame and the windows are E-glass.

H. Cooke stated that the proposal is a great addition and will be very appealing from the inside. H. Nelson expressed concern about additional tree loss due to the utility line installation. Jack West, Land Use Engineer, stated that he and the municipal arborist will walk the site to determine which trees will remain. He advised that one for one tree replacement is required in the ordinance and this will be done. W. Wolfe stated that the white trim on the church does not seem appropriate and he encouraged the applicant consider an earth tone color to blend. He stated that he is supportive of this proposal but has concerns about the sunlight in the sanctuary during the daytime. Mr. Farewell stated that the forest will help buffer the light.

Based upon the foregoing, a motion was made by Ms. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Cooke and carried by a vote of eight ayes to classify this application as a minor site plan, endorse the joint Engineering and Zoning Report dated March 24, 2014 and to recommend approval of the application.

#### COMMENTS

1. The applicant should consider painting all the exterior trim in earth-tone colors. White trim does not seem appropriate.
2. Due to the potential for additional trees to be removed for utility installation, the municipal arborist and engineer should determine which trees are to be removed.

Vote on motion:

For: Bush, Cerutti, Cooke, Molina, Nelson, Rew, Robinson, Wolfe

Against: None

Abstain: None

H. Nelson left the meeting.

- b) ROI Renovations & Development  
Major Site Plan with variance  
255 Nassau Street  
Block 48.01, Lots 7 & 8  
File #P1414-001P  
MLUL Deadline: 7/4/14

Representatives for the Applicant: Rosalind Westlake, Esq.; Joseph Steiger, GreenSite Engineering & Consulting; Lou Carnevale, property owner; Alfredo Trevino, AIA; Linda Fahmie, applicant.

Rosalind Westlake, Esq., legal counsel for the applicant, stated that one variance identified in the joint report from the Engineer and Zoning Officer relates to the height of the vegetation. There are trees in place that are 6 feet in height so additional trees had not been proposed, to eliminate the variance the applicant will plant six foot arborvitae. She advised that there is a legal issue

pertaining to the access to the property and she is working this out with the Planning and Zoning Board attorneys. Jack West, Land Use Engineer, stated that the proposal will be presented to the Planning Board but the variance needed for the separation of the driveway will be presented before the Zoning Board. He advised that the applicant may have to present the plan to both boards. Ms. Westlake stated that the applicant is hopeful that two reviews are not needed. She advised that NJDOT approval for the proposed driveway on Nassau Street has been received.

Joseph Steiger, engineer for the applicant, referred to the staff reports and stated that tables were requested in the kiosk area but the applicant does not wish to encourage eating because someone would be responsible to clean the area daily. Pertaining to the trees in the rear of the property, although there is landscaping in place the applicant intends to plant 2-1/2" to 3" caliper trees to satisfy this recommendation. A fence is proposed which will tie in with the building. Linda Fahmie, applicant, stated that tables are not proposed in the kiosk area because space is being provided on the rooftop for the residents for eating and relaxing. Mr. Steiger stated that the engineer recommended relocating the transformer but this cannot be done because there is no other space for this. Ms. Fahmie stated that landscaping will be provided around the transformer as a visual buffer.

Jack West, Land Use Engineer, stated that a standard sized parking stall is proposed in the southeasterly portion of the parking area. Because of the difficulty to maneuver a car out of that space, he recommended moving the curb line and making this a compact sized stall. W. Wolfe stated that alternate parking stalls are not good choice and recommended making all the spaces in this portion of the parking area compact spaces. Mr. West stated that the applicant can reduce the parking stall size to 18 feet which will result in a variance but he would recommend approval of that variance order to provide more space for the landscape strip. Mr. Steiger stated that right turn movements in and out of the site for a 30 foot single unit truck will be demonstrated. W. Wolfe asked for a restriction in the lease about the size of a truck permitted on site.

W. Wolfe stated that he is not in favor of having two driveways from Nassau Street. The applicant stated that the owner of Lot 16 (Princeton University) appears to unwilling to grant an acceptable license to the applicant. Ms. Westlake stated that the NJDOT determined that this is the best location for the driveway. Mr. West stated that there may be issues from the NJDOT if the driveway access is not constructed as proposed. Ms. Westlake stated that on October 20, 2011 the University's Real Estate Acquisition Department told the applicant that they would give them an easement for Lot 16 but this was not done. The owner has been trying for 28 years to make this work and they would like permanent access and not just a license for long term access. W. Wolfe recommended that a representative from the University be present at the Planning Board hearing to address this issue. Ms. Westlake stated that without the easement, the owner is not allowed to use Lot 16 to access their property but individual tenants of the building have gotten temporary licenses to access. Due to this the only way for permanent access to the property is for the proposed curb cut from Nassau Street.

Lou Carnevale, property owner, stated that using the existing driveway to access their property is preferred but because of the legal problems over time they want to ensure access to their property separate from the University land. Mr. Wolfe stated that he recommended approval of the curb cut to access the property if the applicant is not able to get the easement.

Ms. Westlake advised of the bank hours: Monday through Friday - 8:30 am to 8:30 pm, Saturday - 8:30 am to 3pm and Sunday - 11am to 3pm. She said she was advised that the hours are subject to change. Regarding the recommendation for trash compacting, she stated that this is a bank function and they do their own compacting inside the building and an independent contractor will be hired to pick up the trash. The applicant will return for site plan approval for the kiosk when the tenant is known. A color rendering of the building was presented. W. Wolfe asked that the color rendering of the site plan be presented to the Planning Board. Alfredo Trevino, architect for the applicant, stated that there will be strict guidelines as to what will be permitted on the balconies. P. Rew stated that brick is proposed for the façade but the rendering does not clearly identify the façade as brick.

W. Wolfe stated that the building is right on the property line so access to that side of the building would be prohibited. Mr. West stated that an easement would be needed from the adjacent property owner. W. Wolfe recommended a door at the ground level so an easement would not be required. R. Cerutti stated that windows are proposed on that side of the building and he recommended that the applicant check with the fire official to determine what is required. H. Cooke asked about handicapped access from the parking lot to the elevator and he suggested that the applicant consider a ramp or other appropriate means for the disabled. R. Cerutti stated that the building slab could be lowered so there would no need for a ramp. H. Cooke stated that the windows on the west side of this building should not be facing the windows of the adjacent building and the applicant was asked to review this.

P. Rew stated that the proposed proportion of the piers on the side is going to create a façade that may appear cheap. For quality and character she recommended full brick for the north and east sides but not for the entire length of the building. W. Wolfe suggested that the applicant look at the treatment of the building at 252 Nassau which is similar to what is being proposed. He stated that he does not recommend a large false gable and suggested hip roofs. Members of the board asked the applicant to tone down the proposed trim work on the façade. The proposed design is classical but the design is not consistent around the building and the piers do not align with the mass. Mr. Trevino stated that he will look at this and come back with another rendering. W. Wolfe asked for less contrast between the stucco and the brick on the side. An ad hoc committee was formed to review the revised façade design prior to the applicant returning to this board, the committee members are Wolfe, Rew, Cerutti and Bush. A special meeting of SPRAB was requested by the applicant. Motion was made and seconded to continue the discussion to a special meeting date of Tuesday, April 29<sup>th</sup>. The vote was 7-0 in favor. Motion carried.

W. Wolfe advised that sections of the staircase as depicted on the plans do not match. Mr. Trevino stated that this will be corrected.

With no further business before the Board, motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kerry A. Philip  
Secretary