

Lawrence Township Planning Board  
Regular Meeting  
Monday, December 1, 2014

Present: Christopher Bobbitt  
Philip B. Duran  
Richard S. Krawczun, Municipal Manager  
James Kownacki, Councilman  
Glenn Collins  
Kim Taylor, Vice Chairperson

Excused Absence: Stephen Brame, Councilman  
Ian J. Dember  
Doris Weisberg, Chairperson

Absent: Terrence Leggett  
Aaron Duff

Also Present: James F. Parvesse, Municipal Engineer  
Philip B. Caton, Planning Consultant  
Edwin Schmierer, Planning Consultant  
Susan Snook, Recording Secretary

1. **Statement of Proper Notice**

Adequate notice of this meeting of the Lawrence Township Planning Board has been provided by filing the annual meeting schedule with the Municipal Clerk as required by law, and by filing this agenda and notice with the Municipal Clerk, posting prominently in the Municipal Building, and mailing to the Trenton Times, and the Lawrence Ledger newspapers.

2. **Public Participation (for items no on the agenda)**

None

3. **Minutes for Approval**

None

4. **Applications**

Major Site Plan - Preliminary & Final Approval Application No. SP-5/14; **Porsche of Princeton**; 3331 Brunswick Pike; Tax Map Pages 52.0, Block 5201, Lot 37

Mr. Jeffrey Hall represented the applicant and stated the property is located on the south bound lane of Route 1 on 1.08 acres which is currently a restaurant known as Denny's. The current building is approximately 6,955 sf. The applicant is proposing to construct a showroom facility on the property and that facility will be 10,951 sf and will have two levels. The building will be constructed to have a showroom for the Porsche and service manager intake, repair facilities and offices. There will be customer parking on this location and the intent is also use Lot 36 but to contain the customer experience to Lot 37. There will be landscape improvements and improvements per the Planner's memorandum with a slight increase in the impervious coverage and there are numerous variances being requested.

Witness #1: Bryon Eng, General Manager of Porsche. Mr. Eng stated they wanted to upgrade their facility because when customers come in, there is only one service desk to tend to any customers that come in the door; therefore, the standards are not being met. This application is to improve customer relations and to upgrade the standards of Porsche so when a client comes in to look at a particular vehicle it can be in the showroom, currently it cannot be. There will be 7 to 8 vehicles that will be displayed in the new showroom and service 7 to 8 customers a day, summer service is higher because the cars are sports car and it around 10 – 12 customers a day. The waiting area will be enlarged for accessories, a boutique, larger sitting area, etc.

Mr. Krawczun stated the existing facility would be used for service and parts and the new facility would be for sales and for customers to drive up for service. If the owner brings their car to the new facility that will be driven to the existing lot by an employee and it will be moved back and forth during the business day and will the two existing lots be able to hold inventory.

Mr. Eng stated the inventory, in winter and fall, is less and what they have currently is manageable. Mr. Krawczun stated the two lots will facilitate the new inventory. Mr. Eng stated there is an off-site facility if needed and is rented at Princeton Volvo in one of their back lots. Mr. Eng stated the current inventory is 60 cars and the outside will drop down because they will be indoors.

Mr. Caton stated that the outside appears to be similar to the proposed building with an atrium in the front and two floors in the back; if that building will be used for service and parts will the building be renovated for that purpose and what part will the showroom be. Mr. Eng stated it will be renovated and bays will be added.

Witness #2: John Manilio: REDCOM Design and Construction.

Exhibit A1- Aerial Map, dated December 1, 2014 which shows the property. Mr. Manilio gave a brief description of the property, including there are some non-conforming uses on the existing lot: lot width 200 feet is required and the existing lot is 147.6 sf; the impervious surface ratio is .7 is required and existing is .772.

Exhibit A2: Site Plan Rendering, dated December 1, 2014 which consists of landscaping. The existing building is proposed to be demolished and is being replaced with a 2-story building with a total square footage of 10,951 sf. The entrance off Route 1 is for entering only and on the northwest corner of the property. There are minor site improvements to be done to the site. All the parking and curbing will remain; customer parking is in the south side of the building with seven spaces; employees will park on the east side. The lot meets all the bulk standards with the exception of two: rear yard setback where 60' is required and 60.7 is being proposed. The other relief is for impervious coverage which is currently .772 and .786 is being proposed.

There are 62 parking spaces being proposed and 25 spaces are required per the Land Use Ordinance. Mr. Manilio discussed the landscaping and stated two more trees will be added by the access road, two more trees to the north of the lot; added more lower lying shrubs along the frontage of the lot, and along the detention basin shrubs will be added. The existing location of the lights will remain; but will be replaced with up to date lights. The building will have four new lights, which two of them will remain on for security reasons.

Several signs on the building are being proposed and the directional signs will be moved to the south of the driveway. The size and height of the sign is 2.5' and 4 sf in area; the sign proposed is 4' in height and 6 sf.

Exhibit A3: Exterior Rendering, dated September 29, 2014 (proposed signs). Mr. Caton stated the size of the two signs is still in the standard that is permitted for one façade sign. A free standing sign is located along Route 1 and is 12' from the property line and it should be moved to a 15' setback. Mr. Krawczun stated there is a need to move it back three feet. Mr. Manilio stated to move it back three feet or ask for a relief from the Board. Mr. Krawczun asked when the sign was installed. Mr. Manilio stated in July or August and a permit was applied for. Mr. Parvesse stated it was approved to be in the same spot and with New Jersey Department of Transportation performing the improvements; it will have to be moved back. Mr. Parvesse explained the improvements of New Jersey Department of Transportation. Porsche did take into consideration the work that will be performed by New Jersey Department of Transportation; it will affect parking lot spaces and the sign. There is a sketch that will show how it will be re-worked.

Vice Chairperson Taylor asked how the Board will approve this application. Mr. Caton stated it should be approved as it is today because if you give them approval it will be to construct the application as presented. The free standing sign will be moved sooner or later after New Jersey Department of Transportation performs their work. Mr. Caton stated the entrance from Route 1 will be closed.

Mr. Manilio stated a meeting with New Jersey Department of Transportation for the proposed changes and the Route 1 entrance will be closed and construction will be spring of next year. Mr. Caton stated it will affect the seven spaces in the front and the intention is to replace some of those spaces with display cars. It will also displace some of the detention basin which is included in the New Jersey Department of Transportation plan. Mr. Manilio stated New Jersey Department of Transportation will be constructing a deceleration lane into the Mall and the detention basin will be moved off-site to contain the water. Mr. Caton asked about where the free standing sign will be moved. Mr. Manilio stated it will be dictated by the franchise. Mr. Manilio stated it is not sure of the location of the sign because of New Jersey Department of Transportation.

Mr. Collins stated to agree to leave it where it is because it will be moved eventually. Mr. Krawczun stated it is okay where it is now until New Jersey Department of Transportation work is done; however, he doesn't want the setback to be less than what it is now. At that point it should be corrected to comply. Mr. Caton asked about the seven parking spaces and understands that DOT will remove those seven spaces; but you testified that you will only be losing five; why? Mr. Manilio explained that the front portion will be taking seven spaces and others spaces will be removed so the proposal is to put the spaces in the front. Mr. Caton stated the spaces will be along the perimeter of the entire property and around the building. Mr. Krawczun stated that the landscaped area will not be used to display cars because it is in the Land Use Ordinance, now or in the future. Mr. Manilio stated no cars will be parked on any grass areas now or in the future.

Exhibit A4: Interior Rendering, dated September 29, 2014 show the desk service, more cars in the showroom and more space for each client. Mr. Krawczun stated there is a Circulation Impact Report, that was submitted by REDCOM Design & Construction prepared by Gregory Redington so can Mr. Manilio testify for this report. Mr. Krawczun read the following: "this was a limited scope of study that is appropriate for this project, measurements of traffic volumes were not obtained for this project", the existing conditions how the trips were identified if the measurement for traffic volumes were not taken. Mr. Manilio stated it is based on the square footage of buildings and the existing facility. A study was not done on Route 1 and it was done from studies prepared in the pass.

Mr. Caton stated it was suggested that a driveway connection to the two lots and there are only 20 trips between the two lots, if the application is made for both lots simultaneously, and you have two buildings, it would be logical to have a driveway connection between the two lots as opposed to two traffic systems. Mr. Manilio stated they looked at the access between the two properties and the pros are they are easily accessible between the two lots; but was seen was the lose of parking spaces and the impervious coverage is over and is owned by two different owners and is under a lease at the present time. Mr. Hall also stated it would have concerns of customers or the public using the access driveway to go to the back of the building, which is being used for service only. Mr. Caton stated a cross easement will be required. Mr. Hall stated he will try with the other property owner. Mr. Caton stated an easement could be up to the property line and if unsuccessful with the other property owner, it could be there for some future time and would be available. Mr. Collins asked if it was a walkway or driveway and Mr. Caton stated both.

Witness #3: James Kyle of Kyle Planning & Design. Mr. Kyle stated the overall benefit is it will replace the existing building with an attractive building to the site, very modern looking building and is a benefit on redeveloping this site. Mr. Kyle discussed the different variances for lot width, impervious coverage, rear yard setback for Lot 36, directional signs for 3' in height; number of façade signs (2 proposed and 1 is permitted), variance for the projective sign which is not permitted in a highway commercial zone. There are exceptions for the landscaping and loading area.

Mr. Kyle went over the variances and why the Board should grant these variances as well as Mr. Caton's report dated November 21, 2014, copy attached and gave his opinions for each item of the variances regarding signs.

Mr. Krawczun questioned the height of the sign and the front sign after it is relocated will it comply to the Land Use Ordinance. Mr. Collins stated if we allowed it here then will have to allow it for everyone else for the height of a sign The directional sign will read "sales, parking and parts and service". Mr. Hall stated it would be a safety concern to make sure the sign is visible to the clients. Mr. Caton stated the real safety issue is the cars exiting and not entering and having to contend to visibility and turning in toward the Mall.

Mr. Kyle stated it is to direct people to the other lot and will draw people to the second driveway and the not the first driveway. Mr. Caton stated he likes where the original driveway was located on the other side. Mr. Kyle agreed to moving it back.

Mr. Caton suggested to the Board if it grants the variance it is to accommodate this temporary situation where the sign was installed in the wrong location not because the 15' setback as in our ordinance; it was put in the wrong location and should be put in the proper setback in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Caton summarized the conditions.

5. **Old Business / New Business / Correspondence**

None

6. **Adjournment:**

There being no further to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.  
Digital audio file of this meeting is available upon request.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan J. Snook  
Recording Secretary

Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_



g:\engineering office\p b minutes\2014 p. b. minutes\december 1, 2014.doc