

**MERCER COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING**

[Link can be found on County Planning website]

**June 08, 2022
9:00 AM**

PRESENT: Michael Shine, Chair
William S. Agress, Vice-Chair
Kristin L. McLaughlin, County Commissioner
Sam Rubino
Dallas Barr
Basit Muzaffar County Engineer
Leslie R. Floyd for Brian Hughes, County Executive

ALSO PRESENT: Robert Ridolfi, Planning Board Counsel
Matthew Zochowski, Planning Board Secretary

Chairman Shine called the meeting of the Mercer County Planning Board to order at 9:02 AM.

I. STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Pursuant to the Sunshine Law, notice of this meeting was sent to the Trenton Times on May 18, 2022, was posted in the County Administration Building on May 18, 2022, and was published in the Trenton Times on May 21, 2022.

II. ATTENDANCE ROLL CALL

All members except for Taiwanda Wilson were present for June Roll Call.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Shine announced that minutes have been distributed from the May 11th, 2022, meeting and asked if there were any comments. There were no comments. Vice-Chairman Agress made a motion to approve the March 09th, 2022 Planning Board minutes which was seconded by Samuel Rubino. All members voted in favor except for Commissioner McLaughlin who abstained from the vote.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Shine asked if there are any public comments this morning related to non-agenda items. There were several members of the public requesting to comment. Chairman Shine welcomed all public attendees to the County Planning Board and discussed process for comments. Chairman Shine discussed providing speakers 2 minutes to speak so that we can get through all comments in a timely fashion.

The following are public comments provided at the June 2022 County Planning Board Meeting:

Tirza Wahrman (West Windsor): An environmental lawyer, Ms Wahrman stated that the largest pending warehouse application in the state does not belong on Quakerbridge and Clarksville Roads nor on a County road. She expressed concern about the dangers to school children and homeowners. She also raised the point that there will be regional impact due to wetlands being built upon, mature trees being removed and increased flood risks. Ms. Wahrman pointed out that the applicant is relying on outdated flood maps from 1999 & 2004 and that new flood maps will reflect the real risk. She states that Clarksville Road already has a threat of flooding in moderate rain.

Geetha Desikan (West Windsor): Ms. Desikan states that the applicant proposed a change to the intersection of Clarksville Road and Route 571 and that the increased traffic will impact local schools. She would like to have an extensive traffic impact study performed that includes occupancy data on all effected roads not just the intersection. She would also like to know if there was school analysis and environmental impact study performed considering the children and teenagers at the schools. Ms. Desikan also questioned who owns, maintains and repairs the bridge that goes over the Amtrak tracks (NEC – Northeast Corridor).

Stacey Fox (West Windsor): Ms. Fox would like to know if the County can make a blanket restriction declaring no trucks on Clarksville Road. She would like to know if the County can guarantee that the residents between Post Road and Route 571 will not have their properties taken in order to widen Clarksville Road for the improvement of the turning radius at the 571 intersection. Ms. Fox also stated that the project is being built on and around wetlands relying on data from outdated flood maps. She would like to know if the new flood maps and rules will apply to this project and will the applicant be required to comply to them.

Padma Katapalli (West Windsor): Ms. Katapalli questions traffic safety and mentioned reaching out to the superintendent of WW Plainsboro school district, and he wasn't involved or informed in this by West Windsor officials. She had similar questions as others regarding the ownership of the NEC Clarksville Bridge.

Niloofer Darbary (West Windsor): Ms. Darbary questions the plan, which uses an outdated 2012 study, to have 6 exits onto Clarksville Road. She is concerned that there will be 1.6 trucks per minute in the morning and roughly 3 trucks per minute in the evening. She states that there are between 7,000 and 10,000 commuters and 2,300 students currently using the roads and that havoc will be created with the addition of the trucks.

Arundhati Bhosle (West Windsor): A licensed professional engineer and resident of Clarksville Road, Ms. Bhosle is concerned that the original traffic impact study for the project did not include Clarksville Road as an entry point and there have been no additional studies that show that. She stated that there is currently a new warehouse on Route 571 that has already increased traffic. She also would like it noted that the bridge over the Amtrak tracks is in disrepair.

Following these discussions, Mr. Ridolfi reminded attendees that this application is not before the County at this time as it is still incomplete. The County cannot discuss an application that it has not fully reviewed, and several comments all relate to the same concerns regarding this project. As a result, Mr. Ridolfi recommended that any remaining public participants and those that spoke submit formal written correspondence via email to Jill Benner who will collect all questions and comments.

At this time, the County Planning Board has not received any other written correspondence regarding the Bridge 8 project.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Status of appeal by OTR East Windsor Investors, LLC (the "Developer") with Mercer County Planning Board's Site Plan decision requiring, Inter alla, the Developer to provide a cross access easement for vehicular traffic from its proposed residential development to a neighboring/adjacent residential development.

Director Floyd gave an overview of the new appeal to the Supreme Court. Mr. Ridolfi mentioned that the applicant has returned to the Township Planning Board with revisions to their plans.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business. Andrew Lloyd mentioned that there will be two new sewer service amendments at next month's meeting. Chairman Shine and others discussed concerns about availability and attendance at upcoming meeting and vacations. Planning staff and Board members will coordinate on upcoming meetings and any special meetings.

IX. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Shine asked for the motion to adjourn the meeting and Mrs. Wilson made the motion. Mr. Rubino seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 a.m. with the following vote:

Y Michael Shine
Y Samuel Rubino
Y Samuel Frisby
Y Dallas Barr

Y William S. Agress
Y Basit Muzaffar
Y Leslie R. Floyd
Y Commissioner McLaughlin

Respectfully Submitted,



Matthew Zochowski, Planning Board Secretary

