

SITE PLAN REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD

NOTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, July 8, 2015

PRINCETON MUNICIPAL BUILDING

Meeting Room A –7:30 P.M.

Princeton, New Jersey

PRESENT: Alyce Bush, Harry Cooke, Dana Molina, Lydia Robinson, William Wolfe

ABSENT: Robert Cerutti, Robert Freudenberg, Holly Nelson, Pamela Rew

ALSO PRESENT: Jack West, Municipal Engineer; Derek Bridger, Zoning Officer; Kerry A. Philip, Secretary

Secretary Philip 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 4th day of December, 2014.

MINUTES

- a) February 11, 2015 – Motion was made by D. Molina and H. Cooke seconded the motion to approve the minutes. The vote was 4-0 in favor of those eligible to vote. Motion carried.

APPLICATION

- a) Trustees of Princeton University
Minor Site Plan – Architectural Lab
Washington and FitzRandolph (north of Faculty)
Block 50.01, Lot 18
File #P1515-195PM
MLUL Deadline: 7/10/15

Representatives for the applicant: Christopher DeGrezia, Esq., Drinker Biddle & Reath; Brian Perry, Van Note Harvey Associates; Dan Topping, NK Architects; Mark Wilson, applicant; Daniel Casey, applicant; Kristin Appelget, Princeton University Community Relations.

The request by the University is for the reconstruction of the existing Architectural Laboratory located between the Frick Building and Jadwin Gymnasium. Included in the reconstruction will be the renovation of a portion of the existing glass “Labatut Pavilion”, the demolition and reconstruction of the remainder of the building, the removal of a gravel parking/driveway area and construction of a new gravel driveway and loading area, construction of an outdoor concrete “experimental space” and the relocation of the existing bituminous walk located north of the building with a pedestrian connection for access to this building.

Mr. DeGrezia stated that the architectural lab is in an existing building, it is a very small project with 1/3 acre of disturbance. The equipment stored in this location is being modernized with robotics and reconstruction of the building is proposed to increase the height of the building. There are paved areas that will be used for experimental space therefore the impervious coverage will be slightly increased to provide additional head room but the proposed building will utilize the same

footprint of the existing building. Stormwater management is proposed because nothing is in place now. He stated that the site will function as it functions today with no increased intensity of use and no additional employees.

Brian Perry, engineer for the applicant, referenced a color version of the Site Layout Plan (Sheet CE-5) and stated that they are proposing improvements involving pedestrian access including an accessible ramp on the north side and another ramp on the south side of the building. Bike racks are proposed at the northwest and northeast corners of the building, nothing is proposed by the main entrance because it provides emergency access. The applicant does not wish to provide bike racks by the main entrance.

Dan Topping, architect for the applicant, stated that the building is not a 24 hour facility, students come to this space when working on a specific project. Technology continues to change and a lot of open head room is needed for robotics, the glass pavilion that was constructed in 1940 will remain. Three robots are envisioned within the building, there will also be space under the lattice work which will provide room for teaching and experimentation. When experiments involving cold temperatures are scheduled, foam boards are installed within the glass pavilion. No heating or cooling is proposed, there will be two fans (one at each end of the building) that extract the air for cooling and heat is provided with radiant heated flooring around the perimeter of the building. Radiant cooling may be considered in the future, a second system for providing heat is proposed with piping heated water to coils within the ceiling. Mr. Topping stated that they are proposing another sustainable approach to capture the heated water within the Frick Building, heated water would be taken to a mechanical room and placed within a vessel so it can be sent to wherever it is needed. Chairman Wolfe asked about rooftop installation of HVAC and Mr. Topping stated that no units are proposed on the roof. Chairman Wolfe recommended a green roof and Mr. Topping stated that it is a wooden frame building and a light roof is needed therefore a green roof will not be proposed.

Mr. Perry stated that subsurface stormwater storage is being proposed beneath the outdoor lab space, all areas will drain towards this area into rain leaders and then into the basin which is being designed for a 100 year storm event.

H. Cooke noted that the beauty of the pathway on the west side of the building is being removed and recommended a notation that new plantings will replace any landscaping that is removed.

Mark Wilson, Applicant, stated that the trash from this building is collected and stored internally until University staff picks up the trash with micro vehicles and all trash is taken to a facility on the other side of Jadwin Gymnasium.

Chairman Wolfe referenced the Fire Protection sheet and stated that the line is the same desirable line for a bike path. Kristen Appelget, applicant, stated that the proposed bike path connects to the nature trail which is connected to the pedestrian bridge. Chairman Wolfe then noted that it is frustrating for a bicyclist to find a place to lock up a bike when the racks are scattered. He suggested one central area for bike storage instead of three separate areas. Mr. Topping stated that the maximum occupancy for this building is 12. Mr. DeGrazia stated that the proposal improves access from both sides of the building. The building will function better with this design. Mr. DeGrazia stated that they agreed with most items within the staff reports with the exception of the bike racks. A 200% increase in the number of bike rack storage is recommended, the applicant feels that everything will function much better as designed. Mr. Topping stated that LED lighting

is proposed in four areas and presented Sheet CE-9 dated 3/30/15 revised 7/8/15. Mr. Topping stated that the lighting is sufficient.

Chairman Wolfe asked the applicant to remove the surface mounted light and exposed conduit on the glass pavilion and suggested replacing the rotting wood on the pavilion. Mr. Wilson stated that the light by the doorway is used occasionally and further review is needed.

Chairman Wolfe asked the applicant to revise the grading plan for the north elevation to show the final grading and the location of the paved connection from the walkway to the level of the terrace.

Chairman Wolfe suggested that the construction vehicles be limited to the east side of the parcel, the chain link fence shown along the western side of the project area should act as a barrier to construction vehicles and sufficient protection for all trees and shrubs to its west. If the construction vehicles are stored on the west side then tree protection is needed.

He then stated that the applicant should locate the gate and fence after they take into account what is needed which will define where people can and cannot walk.

Chairman Wolfe stated that there is a grade drop at the southern end of the terrace and asked if a guard rail is needed. Mr. Topping stated that they will try to raise the grade but if this is not possible then a timber guardrail will be installed if a guardrail is not already in place. Chairman Wolfe asked if the landscape plan will be revised because there are inaccuracies in what was presented. Mr. Topping stated that a plan identifies what they envision for this space. H. Nelson stated that the landscaping within the rain garden is not represented well. She asked that the landscaping within the rain garden area be replaced if it is disturbed during construction. A note should be added to the plan.

Mr. Wilson stated that the University will have someone on site every day so the area will be protected, if there is a potential for disruption they will put in a full construction fence. Mr. Wolfe asked that a note be added to the plan.

Chairman Wolfe asked the applicant to consider using the same style of bike racks that are being used at the Frick building. Mr. Wilson stated that the bike racks proposed are the most cost effective, they will review this but financially they prefer the style proposed.

H. Cooke stated that item 4.2 within the report should be deleted, there is no driveway from Faculty to this site.

Based upon the foregoing, a motion was made by H. Cooke, seconded by D. Molina and carried by a vote of five ayes to classify this application as a Minor Site Plan, endorsing all the recommendations contained in the joint Engineering and Zoning Report dated June 17, 2015 with the exception of Item 6(b) and recommends approval with the following conditions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The applicant must add a note to the landscape plan that all plantings in the area of the rain garden basin that are disturbed or removed during construction shall be replaced.
2. The applicant must add a note to the landscape plan that all plantings in the area to the west of the building that are disturbed or removed during construction shall be replaced.

3. The exterior light and exposed conduit on the east face of the glass pavilion are to be removed. A ground mounted lighting source may be provided in the area if needed for safety or to illuminate the pavilion.
4. The applicant will provide a timber guardrail along the southern edge of the driveway south of the terrace. The guardrail will either match an existing guardrail or a detail of the new guardrail must be provided.
5. A guardrail should be provided along the southern edge and SE corner of the terrace, unless the grade of the sloped planting area between that driveway and the terrace can be raised to within thirty inches of the terrace. A handrail should be provided at the adjacent ramp.
6. The chain link fence shown along the western side of the project area should act as a barrier to construction vehicles and sufficient protection for all trees and shrubs to its west. The gate should be signed for emergency vehicles only. It appears that it could be moved somewhat to the west if more room for construction is needed.
7. The grading plan and the grades shown on the north elevation should be revised to show the final grading and location for the paved connection from the walkway to the level of the terrace.
8. The applicant will consider installing the same style bike racks that are installed at the Frick Building.
9. Item 4.2(f) should be deleted from the joint Engineering/Zoning report because there is no access to this site from Faculty Road.

COMMENT

Chairman Wolfe asked the applicant to investigate a more direct path to the NE building entrance from the main driveway.

Vote on motion:

For: Bush, Cooke, Nelson, Molina, Wolfe

Against: Wolfe

Abstain: None

With no further business before the Board, motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kerry A. Philip
Secretary