

## Minutes

The regular meeting of the Warren County Planning Board was held on Monday, May 22, 2023 in person and using WebEx and conducted through electronic communications equipment to preserve the health, safety and welfare of the public in conformance with N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, et seq. [the Open Public Meetings Act]. Chairman Gerald Norton called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

### Warren County Planning Board

An announcement was read as required by the Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 to 10:4-21.

#### Roll Call

Present: William G. Gleba, County Engineer  
James Kern, Commissioner  
Nichole Meuse  
Gerald Norton  
David Smith

Alternate Present: Terry Urfer, Alternate 1  
Robert Hopkins, Alternate 2  
Lori Ciesla, Commissioner

Also Present: Ryan Conklin, Asst. Planning Director  
David K. Dech, Planning Director  
Matthew Moench, County Planning Board Attorney

#### SALUTE TO THE FLAG

#### MINUTES

The minutes of the April 24, 2023 meeting were approved on a motion by Ms. Meuse, seconded by Mr. Gleba. Motion carried with Ms. Ciesla, Mr. Kern, Mr. Norton, Mr. Smith & Mr. Urfer abstaining.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

The public comment portion of the meeting was opened on a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Gleba. The public audience was instructed that they should wait if their comments pertained to the Transportation Master Plan Amendment, which would take place next on the agenda. With no one coming forth to address the Board, the public comment portion of the meeting was closed on a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Gleba. Motion carried.

#### 2023 Transportation Master Plan Amendment

Mr. Conklin stated that this was a minor amendment to the master plan and that the Planning Department notified all municipalities, posted legal notice in papers of record, website & outreach. He also mentioned that the master plan was discussed during the April Board of County Commissioners' meeting and at the February and April Planning Board meetings. They have been working on this since the beginning of the year. They are making an amendment to what was a comprehensive master plan that was completed in 2021-2022. It was officially adopted last year. The Planning Department is now moving forward with some implementation strategies as a result of the comprehensive master plan completed last year. These strategies are both from the planning level and an engineering standpoint, infrastructure standpoint, a policy standpoint. This is the planning policy and with guidance from municipalities to ultimately be in a position help guide developers and municipalities for the most efficient routing to state highways. The county has been taking significant efforts to

address where we have been having issues. They have adopted a resolution that was sent to NJ DOT to restrict large truck traffic on a series of county roadways. There has been no action from NJ DOT as of yet. They have conducted several studies and analysis up and down on County Route #519. Also safety studies, traffic analysis, traffic impact analysis are one part of that comprehensive master plan. This will be one of many steps to continue to address the truck traffic. The county has been on this for years and the state has in the past year gotten on the bandwagon. Please keep in mind the county has limited authority when it comes to development. Authority is based on the development regulations primarily given to Stormwater and impacts on county roads. Mr. Conklin did a PowerPoint presentation of the Transportation Master Plan. It was mentioned that the state just announced that Warren County is getting \$2.6 million dollars in grants for additional road improvements geared towards alleviating traffic at the Strykers Road intersection. Mr. Conklin stated that we did not receive any comments or opinions towards the amendment.

Mr. Conklin summarized the only written comment received from Mr. Menegis, White Township – Warehouses going on farms. Connecting roads from Route #22. White Township should change its zoning.

Mr. Norton asked the board if they had any questions or comments before they opened it up for public comment. Mr. Kern stated that he wanted to thank the staff for this project, which has been going on for a long, long time. He also wanted everyone to know that this is not the final product. The county will continue to adapt and react to the development as they see it happening. What is important is the cooperation with the municipalities. We need to look at what the county can and cannot do. We go above and beyond to address truck traffic. We have been in contact with law enforcement (local & state) and they are crafting ordinances. He feels all this is a step in the right direction.

Ms. Meuse stated that from a municipality level (she is Deputy Mayor, Hardwick Township) one of the big things is keeping the developing relationship with our local municipalities and our local law enforcement in order to get say “that road enforced so trucks don’t make that left hand turn and don’t follow those roads”. We need to have ongoing continuing commitment to relationships with our state police, with our local government police so that those laws are followed and when they are broken, there are summons issued. She feels it is important for the local municipalities to continue those relationships. She also wanted to second what Commissioner Deputy Kern said “thank you for all the hard work”.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

The public hearing was opened on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Mr. Smith.

- Laura Winiarski, C.R. #632 Asbury – in regards to the Existing Truck Restrictions and Truck Routes, C.R. #632 is incorrectly identified. C.R. #632 is currently a 102 restricted road with postings at Route #173, Route #57 and Route #31.
  - Mr. Conklin replied that they will double check that.
  - Ms. Winiarski stated she wanted to thank for doing the Class #5 routes to get the dump trucks restricted. They need enforcement. This road has been a 102 restricted road for 25 years that she has been in her home. The biggest problem on C.R. #632 is the turn at Asbury Willows, they can’t make that turn. The trucks braking coming down the hill, rocks the houses every single morning, starting at 5am. The state police, no one is enforcing anything, they just keep coming and coming. She could show you videos of it. If there is an accident on Route #78, it’s just constant all day long. . She would also like to recommend that Master Plan provide guidance to the municipalities to require that all traffic studies be viewed not independently, like they are today but be review cumulatively. When viewed independently, it puts the community at a disadvantage because it is not taking in to the fact of the cumulative effect of the traffic of trucks and whatnot.
  - Mr. Conklin stated that they do take this in to account in our review of traffic studies.
  - Ms. Winiarski stated that Franklin Township said that they have to look at them independently and it is not fair them because it is accumulative for them. We are the ones paying the taxes, we are the ones living with the burden of what they decide.
  - Mr. Conklin stated that was an excellent recommendation.

- Mr. Conklin was asked to give the definition of a 102 restriction by Mr. Bodolsky for educational purposes.
  - Mr. Conklin stated that a 102 restriction is for anything over 102” Wide and there is a length restriction, but he was not sure of what it was. Mr. Dech stated it was geared towards double-trailers.t. Mr. Gleba stated as long as they are under 102” they are not in violation. Mr. Conklin stated it is something they can double check. As far as he is aware, it is anything over 102”. They have made that request with the DOT.
- Mr. Kern requested the Planning Department to reach out to the municipalities to see who looks at the studies accumulatively and who doesn’t.
  - Mr. Conklin stated that very few municipalities require traffic studies.
  - Mr. Moench wanted to remind the public audience that the Planning Board does not oversee or have authority over local boards. The County Planning Board gives recommendations like we talked about before, they can give policy guidance, and they can hope to get people to work together for a comprehensive vision, but the County Planning Board is not an appellant board that gets to go back to a particular town and state that we don’t like it so we are going to say “no”. We can’t tell a town how much industrial space they should zone or this property should be zoned residential. multi-family or farmland. All those decisions are left to the municipalities to decide their zoning process. The County Planning Board gives guidance; some applications never come in front of us because they don’t involve a county road or county land or affect county drainage facilities. Other projects that do come in front of us, the county has certain authority over. An example is, if you build on a county road, then we can come back to you and say, “your driveway needs to be 50 feet further to the right because we don’t think you are going to have enough site distance”. If they move it 50 feet to the right, then we cannot go back and say we don’t like it what you are doing here, so we are going to say “no”. If we tell them to move it and they do, then they are comply with development regulations. The County Planning Board looks at all these applications from a technical standpoint, not from a well we think it should be farmland or commercial or whatever it may be. So that’s what he was talking about local zoning. The commissioners have been very active to try to get towns to look at the issues that come up where you may live in one town and one town over is doing something you don’t like, but it impacts your town, like Mr. Conklin stated, it’s a formal state which means every town gets to decide its own planning alone. That is also what happens at a zoning meeting, so the discussion about accumulative studies we can control studies that we do with this board, but the zoning or planning board in any given town wants to look at an application, they can request any information they think is helpful to them and then make their decisions. It may be something like one town wants more traffic studies and another town wants none. The County Planning Board can ask for our study but we can’t force them to do traffic studies. Mr. Moench wanted to make sure the public understood the county’s planning board’s process is and things like the Master Plan is to provide overall guidance to all municipalities and where have authority gives us a little extra leverage when an application comes over in the future that’s going to have traffic that is not on a truck route that we want, that might give a little extra ability to it on a truck route or require some more or something else from them to make it better. It doesn’t mean we can just turn around and veto a project, but it would give us a lot more tools. This study is on truck routes, there may be something where one of you might come forward and say hey there’s a really bad intersection you should study the intersection. That may be absolutely accurate but this study is specifically on the truck maps. Because otherwise you have to get one thing done at a time or otherwise, we are never going to get anything done. So that’s the goal, this is the truck route and the thoughts and activities that the commissioners are doing on other topics. That is my comments and thank you for sharing.
  - Mr. Dech stated that he looked up the 102 restriction on the internet and a 102 truck is a standard truck that is greater than 96” but not longer than 102” in width exclusive of mirrors and other safety devices, which meet the equipment length set forth. So it’s a truck larger than 102”.
- Neil, Asbury – He agrees with Ms. Winiarski that there is not one tractor-trailer that comes down that road that can make that turn legally. We live right there, we constantly hear the beeps and honking that trucks have to wait until a car can move to get out of the way. I understand your point about the

Planning Board, but if someone doesn't look at these intersections what is the sense of doing it, if they can say well this is what we are going to do and well you can't make that turn and yeah you can't fit under that bridge. So it's important that you look at this and as far as the speeding, I don't understand what the county can and can't do. About a year ago, we had a resident killed there from a speeder, we've been begging the township and the county and we go back and forth for the last two (2) years are pretty close to maybe building a committee but everybody sits there saying it's your problem. We have state police camping out a couple days a week, but as soon as they are gone, everybody is flying through again. It starts from 5 o'clock in the morning until about noon time, we have people going about 55-60 miles an hour through town, with a 25 mile hour limit, the kids are there with the school buses. How do we get a speeding limit started with the township? The county varies that, so the county is responsible. Why don't we get a committee started like you did with the trucks for speeding.

- Mr. Conklin suggested to submit a formal correspondence to the county articulating your concerns and we will see if there is anything we can do to try and address it and access it
- Neil asked if they could submit videos.
- Mr. Moench stated that any documentation that can help us, but this goes back to unfortunately with government you have a lot of this, residents saying but it's a county road. The county has certain jurisdiction over certain aspects of the roads, but as you know the county does not have a police force so it's typically the local police force for enforcing traffic safety. If we are getting complaints, the county can try to work with the municipality to encourage it, but we cannot force a town to comply and look at certain aspects of signage and certain aspects of what the speed limit is NJDOT sometimes gets involved in that too. There are signs for 102 and local traffic only and the township even has a "no Jake brake" ordinance, but nothing is followed, no tickets are issued.
- Mr. Norton had to interrupt and asked the resident to email his concerns to [publicinfo@co.warren.nj.us](mailto:publicinfo@co.warren.nj.us)
- Ms. Sutters, C.R. #519, Harmony – does the new traffic plan you are working on include C.R. #519 from Route #80 all the way to Route #22?
  - Mr. Conklin stated that they looked at the entire county truck routing related to industrial. When they get to Route #46 they would have to go east or west.
  - Ms. Sutters wanted to know if they would be able to travel through Harmony.
  - Mr. Conklin went over the proposed routes.
  - Ms. Sutters stated it wouldn't make any difference for them then.
- Mr. Bodolski, C.R. #519, Hope – asked if they could turn the map around. He is confused on what is restricted and what isn't, since the resolution indicates that Route #519 in its entirety would be 102 restricted.
  - Mr. Conklin brought the map up that is being considered for ademption.
  - Mr. Moench stated that the county commissioners' have asked for actual restrictions to be put on a whole slew of roads, that is up to the DOT. So we can't control that. The commissioners can advocate like they have, but in reference to implementing something right now, we have to work with what is current law is. So right now, your point about #519, what the restrictions are in place, we may want more, but they are not there. If DOT would come back and add the restrictions we requested, then the county may have to go back and look at this truck routing, that some of the trucks cannot be route there, but we don't know when and if DOT will act. That may be where the confusion is.
  - Mr. Conklin stated that this plan is only a guidance for developers when they come for county approvals.
  - Mr. Bodolski state we need a weight restriction on top of the 102, because the 102 is not going to solve our problem.
  - Ms. Meuse asked the county attorney if the weight restriction is through DOT or the county.
  - Mr. Moench stated that DOT has regulations that they control. The state doesn't want anyone to decide and then it disrupts the whole truck industry.
  - Mr. Dech stated that the engineering study has already been conducted and sent to DOT. We also need resolution of occurrence from the effected municipalities of White Township and Knowlton Township which are not forthcoming. Therefore, the weight restriction is basically on hold at this point.

- Ms. Meuse asked if this restriction is through Hope mainly.
- Mr. Dech replied yes.
- Mr. Imbindo, Asbury – asked who has the jurisdiction over county roads, is it the county or the municipality.
  - Mr. Conklin asked in terms of what?
  - Mr. Imbindo stated law enforcement.
  - Mr. Conklin replied the town.
  - Mr. Imbindo stated they proposed the speed reduction plan to the township and after months they finally sent it to the county it just keeps getting sent back and forth for like two (2) years, going in to the third year and nothing has been done about it. It is frustrating and it easy to see how people lose faith in the government. Franklin Township sold out the taxpayers with the Debais thing. This thing gets approved with having all that farmland preservation all around them. They had environmental planners tell them that this site is not good to build on, I feel sorry for the neighbors in those houses that they sold out. They have been paying taxes there for years and this is what they are going to get back. It is just sickening to see this happen in Franklin Township and Warren County. I think this is one of the nicest spots left in New Jersey and we are getting warehouses. Thank you.
  - Mr. Kern requested that we reach out to Franklin Township to see where this is at and what the holdup is.
  - Ms. Meuse added that the state & local police are very short staffed and they are doing everything, where they can, however, they cannot hit the areas if they don't know about them. You have to stay in contact with your local municipality, state & local police. You have to get involved.
- Mr. Herb, White Township – would like clarity on who is in charge of the county roads. Secondly, I think a lot of towns have been doing work on their mapping plans.
  - Mr. Moench stated that he was going to give Mr. Herb a very lawyerly answer, which unfortunately will not be as concrete as he would like. There are a lot of regulations that impact different things. At a starting point, local municipalities control the enforcement of traffic laws, whether it is truck weight restrictions, speeding enforcement of local or state police of all normal traffic issues. Noise from using the brakes they are not supposed to, which is incredibly hard to actually catch someone, but my point is whatever police department it is in charge for the safety of your community. Local municipalities are in control of the zoning of what is ultimately built within their town. The county controls certain aspects of the road, but sometimes with DOT overlay. An example is, there is a pothole in the road, the county is the one that has to come out and pave the road or repair the pothole or maintain the road and the county also maintains bridges, those types of issues. Speed limits or certain restrictions on the road, some of them are within the county's complete control. Everything has to be backed up by a study with government regulations. The county controls those aspects. When it comes to weight limitations, the county has some say, but as we talked about there are certain classification of roads that the state regulates oversee. So, the county can't just come up and say we are going to pick and choose that we want to have no trucks on C.R. #519 completely. We can say we want it, the commissioners can ask for resolution that we want certain restrictions but it is up to DOT because they don't want a county to decide on its own. Simply as possible, if it's an enforcement issue, it is your local municipal or the police force in charge of your municipality. If it is a physical characteristic of the county road then it is going to be the county with some DOT involvement. A township cannot tell us what the speed limit should be, they can recommend it, but they can't force you to do it.
- Theresa Chapman, Harmony – in regards to Franklin Main Street, since its Main Street, that is a physical characteristic correct?
  - Mr. Moench replied yes.
  - Ms. Chapman asked then who would start that study, the County?
  - Someone started talking about speed bumps. They nixed the speed bumps because they make too much noise. Ms. Chapman then asked about the truck route you are concentrating the truck

- traffic on various roads, so at what point will that maximum capacity be reached and the road needs to be widened and upgraded?
- Mr. Conklin replied that is not to the extent of the analysis. Certainly, down the road there would be a capital improvements.
  - Ms. Chapman did you take in account the maximum capacity as part of this study from the current capacity?
  - Mr. Conklin replied no, the main goal was to get the traffic out to the state highways from the studies.
- Ms. Halloway, Knowlton – thank you for your research and explaining it all. I appreciate your recommendations to divert the traffic on Route #46 & 80, but I don't understand is Route #46 a county road or state.
    - Mr. Dech replied it is a state highway.
    - Ms. Halloway stated then if it was DOT, are there any recommendations that Knowlton can do about the truck traffic?
    - Mr. Conklin replied that he thinks they are looking at some of the issues with DOT along Route #46.
    - Ms. Halloway asked as a resident is there opportunities for them to push in any direction to limit the traffic through our town?
    - Mr. Conklin suggested speaking with NJDOT in terms of restrictions on state highway.
    - Mr. Dech mentioned it is very difficult because trucks will go on the interstate and state highway system.
    - Ms. Halloway – you indicated that no municipalities provided info to your Master Plan. Did you solicit it?
    - Mr. Conklin replied yes we sent out email correspondence.
  - Mr. Hyndman, White Township – stated that he is concerned with the plan and appreciate what you are doing. Particular concern is with the point of Route #46 and C.R. #519 with directing traffic to the left or right, his concern is the corner of White Township School. We already have a traffic problem there with the morning hours and that is a school time and a particular concern is to identify this as a hot spot in the county for accidents. His particular concern would be for the children, school staff and parents coming & going from that area if we are in fact going to be directing additional traffic to that spot particularly given you made reference to this briefly to the potential of stacking that might occur at that particular corner particularly if no adjustments are made to the size and nature of that particular intersection. I would hope at least your report would address that particular facility.
    - Mr. Conklin thanked him for commenting. He also stated that they were working with the DOT on that intersection. Now there is some update designs with lane shifts also to make that a dedicated turn lane. That is all in the works
  - Mr. Estella, White Township – agree with some of what you said, but you left out the fact that tractor-trailers can't make the turn. They have to back up and swing around and when the cars are stacked up and you need them to back up it is difficult. Thank you.
  - Mr. Peterson, Hope – just wanted to echo what Mr. Bodolski said about that they do need a weight limit restriction on C.R. #519 North from Route #46 to Route #80. Everyone knows we have had two (2) fatalities in the past year, one on C.R. #521 near Route #80 with a dump truck and the other was the rolloff truck and a tractor-trailer just south of C.R. #519. In addition to the fatalities, we have historical buildings in center of Hope and when these dump trucks rumble up to the stop sign those foundations vibrate out. Thank you.
  - Unidentified woman from White Township? – asked how the trucks are going to be diverted. She lives off Pequest Drive so you have Route #46, you have the school on Pequest Drive. To try to make a left to get to that traffic light is a bear. Her aunt last year tried to cross and her car got demolished and spent six (6) months in a hospital, so she wants to know how they are going to fix that. That's really all.
  - Ms. Summers, Asbury – wanted to add what the neighbors said about the traffic on Asbury-Bloomsbury Road, I drive it just about every day, truck vehicles, the road is not wide enough no matter what the transportation measurements are, so they won't stay in their lane, and in terms of enforcing the speed, troopers do what they can, but when they do set up, they set up on Main Street, the bottom of the hills, where people live, so transportation study needs to focus on the intersections and where the troopers are. Many of us have mailboxes across the road and we get blown in to the ditch many times by tractor-

trailers or neighbors coming home from work or errands, they have to bypass their driveway because the people behind them are pushing so hard, Safety is not reflected here and some of the other mentionable speed and volume would also be physical and health. There have been studies of the affected by commutes and long commutes. I was one of them for many years, I have been a resident of Asbury for 36 years, so if you measure the response from people as they hear speeding, rumbling, rustling trucks, but not always, or motorcycles, the best we can tell 80 miles per hour regularly at certain time of day and night. Our quality of life, we can't even open our windows in a clean agricultural community and have fresh air has diminished by what is going on. What about the residents?

- Ms. Sabone, Hope – I know you said it is sort of up to the towns to come up with something in their ordinances and since most of us are volunteers, are you going to provide any type of template or suggestions specifically that are related to your wonderful plan here. In other words is you know what we want, you've heard it before,, the weight limit, so if you know what we are looking for, can you provide us with a little bit of help to all of us so we don't have to reinvent the wheel to go back to our board meetings, that would be helpful. That's number 1. When was the last chance to send statements, is today it? Or is it still open for statements from the towns? Is there a deadline?
  - Mr. Moench stated that people can always email and give opinions, the board may act tonight to adopt this plan or not after close of this, so if someone hasn't give public comment, they can still send it, if the board acts to adopt it, the board can be aware of it for the future.
  - Ms. Sabone stated she was basically asking is before you adopt it, there is a chance you adopt it immediately.
  - Mr. Moench replied that it is his expectation.
  - Ms. Sabone then stated in the realm of who is responsible for what, the county has to lobby for the 13 ton weight limit to the NJ DOT, so that is not anything a town can do other than the town to keep begging you.
  - Mr. Moench replied that they could go to NJ DOT directly. That is very helpful. Very, very helpful as the commissioner mentioned earlier.
  - Ms. Sabone you stated that everything we ask for requires a study. Who is paying for it?
  - Mr. Moench replied the regulations are required, the county may not want to study something that is a starting point, but that is part of the problem. There are grants and everything else, but studies cost money. I'm told by the board member to my right, that particular study is already done. But, as a hypothetical, typically if it is a county road, the county is the one that would be responsible for the study. Hope may come in and say they thing this is a problem intersection, the county may say (okay I'm making this up) okay we agree we are going to study it, there may be grants, funding opportunities but as a whole, it's a county road so they undertake that study.
  - Ms. Sabone – the idea that pictures are worth a thousand words, we've been telling some of our people that if you want to say a particular spot is bad, if we take these pictures to show these trucks are having difficulties whether it be pictures or video, who do we send them to and will it make a difference?
  - Mr. Moench replied that it depends on what road. If it is a county road, like C.R. #519, which currently the state permits trucks to go on, we can use that to help bolster the argument to the state. Look we need to weight restrict this road because look here at this example of a truck taking up in the other lane, but that doesn't mean that we have immediate ability.
  - Ms. Sabone said she understands.
  - Mr. Moench replied to send it to everybody. Send it to your local township committee, local representatives, they don't have to act directly but they can contact the county commissioners and planning board and say that Hope council members have concerns over this. If it is a county road, you can send it directly to the county too. Now the county is hearing it from your elected officials in your town and hearing it from the residents, and if it is a state issue it goes right up the ladder, the county turns and says to the state that we're getting emails from our residents, we're getting emails from our local municipalities, help us, help them.

With no one else coming forth to address the Board, the public comment portion of the meeting was closed on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Ms. Meuse. Motion carried.

Mr. Urfer wanted to add that every professional would say that Hope had input in to this. Maybe it was a letter, I don't want to have a misunderstanding, but Hope has been on this for years.

Mr. Urfer also stated that they have met with everybody and he appreciates Lori coming up and what Jim has done, and what Dave has done, Mr. Gleba we've spent endless hours, we've met with members of our town, you have visited our town, so I think it was poor representation from no town, I am not speaking for other towns, but Hope lives and breathes this on a daily basis. Mr. Conklin wanted to verify that they didn't receive a written/formal comment, but like Hope, there have been municipalities that have been pushing to help address these issues.

Mr. Kern wanted to add that they did provide as this various studies have been done that the commissioners have met with the local police departments, provided them with a lot of ordinances and they are taking them to their local prosecutors and judges and some of them they are willing to accept and that will come back to the county. We are also going to be working with safety with those towns, not that not really a county function, but we are trying to bring everyone together. That process has started and this is the proof today.

Ms. Ciesla thanked Mr. Urfer for their mayor helping to get the NJ DOT commissioner out here and spent a lot of time and they are aware of a lot of these problems.

Ms. Meuse mentioned that we (Warren County) are very little compared to the rest of New Jersey. Our commissioners have gone above and beyond to stick up for every single one of our towns. Does not matter what the population is, does not matter size is. They have done things that are well above what they needed to do within their job description for something that is a part time job. They work so hard for each and every one of us and she can't thank them enough. I heard every word from all of you, we all hear you and we will fight with the NJ DOT, these guys will fight with the NJ State Police and your local townships to get exactly what we all want.

## **ADOPTION OF THE 2023 TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT**

On a motion to adopt the resolution, 2023 Transportation Master Plan Amendment was made by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Ms. Meuse. Mr. Moench advised the board to adopt the resolution for the 2023 Transportation Master Plan Amendment as proposed with the confirmation of the mapping change. On a motion to adopt the resolution for the 2023 Transportation Master Plan Amendment as proposed with the confirmation of the mapping change was made by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Ms. Meuse. Motion carried.

Chairman Mr. Norton requested a roll call:

Ms. Ciesla – Yes	Mr. Gleba – Yes	Mr. Kern – Yes	Ms. Meuse – Yes
Mr. Norton – Yes	Mr. Smith – Yes	Mr. Urfer – Yes	Mr. Hopkins – Yes

## **SUBDIVISION & SITE PLAN REPORT**

### Subdivisions

23-033	Phillipsburg	Manor House Home
--------	--------------	------------------

### Site Plans

22-031-SP	Washington Boro & Twp	10 Brass Castle Road, LLC
22-026-SP	Phillipsburg	PR Bridge I78 Phase II Owner Urban Renewal, LLC
22-007-SP	Pohatcong	Larken Associates, LLC
21-009-SP	Blairstown	Hopatcong DD, LLC



21-041-SP	Belvidere	Belvidere Urban Renewal, LLC
21-034-SP	Pohatcong	Paul Matinho/NJ Battery Energy Time Ext. Request

The Subdivision & Site Plan Report was accepted by the Board. Applications were acted upon as noted in the attached report.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

- o Agriculture Development Board – Minutes of March 16, 2023.
- o See listing attached.

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Warren County Planning Department Project Report May 2023. Items of discussion:

10. **I-80 Rockfall Project/S Turn/Retaining Wall** – today there was a local officials public info meeting. DOT is continuing with the project. They will be adding some width to the shoulder of both left and right lanes. They will not be doing anything to fix the S Turns, it is not even on their radar whatsoever. They want to keep the footprint of that road as much as possible.

21. **NJDOT/NJTPA TAP Grant** – Warren County did not get approved, but Phillipsburg did so the county has at least one project approved.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

None

**LIAISON REPORT**

None

**OLD BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

None

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The public comment portion of the meeting was opened on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Ms. Meuse. With no one else coming forth to address the Board, the public comment portion of the meeting was closed on a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Urfer. Motion carried.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m. on a motion by Ms. Ciesla, seconded by Ms. Meuse. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,



David Dech  
Planning Director

**SUBDIVISIONS & SITE PLANS**  
**May 22, 2023**

**SUBDIVISIONS**

Minor subdivisions not located on a county road were reviewed by the Warren County Engineer's Office and the Warren County Planning Department on the below listed dates.

None

Subdivisions previously approved with conditions were submitted and approved on below listed dates.

None

The following subdivisions were previously approved with conditions on or before November 28, 2022. Conditional approvals have now expired and the application is deemed disapproved pursuant to the Warren County Development Review Regulations since the conditions have not been met.

None

**NON COUNTY ROAD (MAJORS)**

The Non County Road Major subdivision report was accepted on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Ms. Meuse. Motion carried.

**23-003**

**Manor House Homes**

Phillipsburg

Block 2701, Lot 5.05

Green Street & Parkwood Court

Description: A preliminary/final Non-County Road residential subdivision. This is an ongoing subdivision in Phillipsburg on Green Street and Parkwood Court for Block 2701 Lots 5.05, 7, 8 and 9. This application is for lot line adjustment on these lots. Lots 8 and 9 were merged and portion of lot 5.05 to be conveyed to lot 7. The site is in the R-75 residential zone.

Approved with conditions:

1. The existing masonry foundation located on Lot 5.05 shall be shown on the plan (similar to that on adjoining Lot 5.04).

**NON COUNTY ROAD (MINOR)**

None

**COUNTY ROAD (MAJORS)**

None

**COUNTY ROAD (MINOR)**

None

**SITE PLANS**

Site plans previously approved with conditions were submitted and approved on the following dates.

None

The following site plans were previously approved with conditions on or before November 28, 2022. Conditional approvals have now expired and the application is deemed disapproved pursuant to the Warren County Development Review Regulations since the conditions have not been met. This report was accepted on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Ms. Meuse. Motion carried.

21-041-SP                      Belvidere                      Belvidere Urban Renewal, LLC

**NON COUNTY ROAD**

The Non County Road site plan report was accepted on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Mr. Smith. Motion carried.

**22-026-SP****PR Bridge I78 Phase II Owner Urban Renewal, LLC**

Phillipsburg

Block 3401, Lot 1

NJH Route 22 and Rand Blvd.

Description: Non-county road site plan, Block 3401 Lot 1 in Phillipsburg, for two (2) logistics/assembly/office buildings totaling 1.7 million square feet as part of the I-78 Logistics Parks warehouse/distribution center. Access to the site is from non-County Roads, US 22 and Rand Boulevard. The site is in the Phillipsburg Commerce Park Redevelopment Zone. Building #1 is 1,408,759 million square feet and Building #4 is 264,059 square feet. The site plan includes 759 new parking spaces and 71.64 acres of impervious surface.

Approved with conditions:

1. A meeting shall be scheduled with the County to review the status and update on the signage plan on truck traffic routing provided to and reviewed by the New Jersey Department of Transportation to address concerns of the County.

## COMMENTS

1. The applicant is hereby notified that Warren County will not accept responsibility for the dam structures or the review of subsequent inspection reports; the responsibility for these items must therefore be assumed by the Municipality(s) or the N.J.D.E.P.
2. A copy of the NJDEP Bureau of Dam Safety permit for the dam structure (Retention Basin South) shall be provided to the County. A copy of the Emergency Action Plan (EAP), if required by the NJDEP Bureau of Dam Safety, shall also be provided to the County.

The Non County Road Site Plan report was accepted on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Ms. Meuse. Motion carried.

### **23-012-SP**

**Moore Energy Group for Warren Asphalt/  
H&K Group**  
Greenwich  
Block 3, Lot 14  
Morris Avenue

Description: Preliminary/Final Non-Residential NCR site plan on Block 3 Lot 14, located in Greenwich Township. This site is on NJ Route 57. This site is currently being used as quarry and asphalt plant. This site is proposing a solar energy system, 407 KWDC/350 KWAC. Total impervious surface is 267,458 Sq. Ft. This is located in the B-1, neighborhood business zone.

Approved with conditions:

1. Provide survey by C. Douglas Cherry & Associates as referenced with the submitted Township application information.
2. The references to right of way widths on County Route 637, North Main Street and Liberty Road shall note the documentation source.
3. The stormwater management plan and maintenance responsibility for the subject property need to be unconditionally approved by the Township of Greenwich Land Use Board. Confirmation of the approval needs to be provided to the County.

## **COUNTY ROAD**

The County Road Site Plan report was accepted on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Mr. Smith. Motion carried.

### **22-031-SP a&b**

#### **10 Brass Castle Road, LLC**

Washington Boro and Washington Twp.  
Block 2.05 Lot 7 and Block 23, Lot 12.01  
Brass Castle Road (CR 623)

Description: County road site plan for a proposed residential rehabilitation facility on a 2.79 acre site located in Washington Borough and Washington Township. The project is located on a flag lot. The 'flag' is 2.45 acre lot located within Block 2.05, Lot 7 in Washington Borough. The 'stem' is a 0.34 acre lot located within Block 23, Lot 12.01 in Washington Township. The site is located on County Route 623 (Brass Castle Road). Proposed access to the project from CR 623 is from an existing driveway in Washington Township. The proposed area of disturbance for the project is located in Washington Borough only. The proposed project will increase the floor area of an existing building by 7,833 square feet to a total floor area of 24,000 square feet. The site currently has 48 parking space and the project proposes to reduce parking spaces to 40 spaces. The project will increase impervious surface by 1,014 square feet. The existing medical/office building on the site is located in the B-1 Highway Business District Zone.

Disapproved for the following reasons:

1. The proposed grading utilized for design on the site plans shall be consistent with the Drainage Area Maps within the Stormwater Management Report. A meeting to review the proposed drainage design shall be scheduled with the County.
2. The shallow depth Manhole C-1 and its associated constructability shall be evaluated for installation of a trench drain similar to the adjoining QuickChek driveway to ensure capture of water before entering the County right of way.
3. The existing "A" inlet to the south along the edge of the roadway pavement shall be modified to an "E" inlet to allow for the proposed 12" CPeP pipe connection from the driveway structure to be constructed.
4. The existing "A" Inlet to the north should be utilized as a connection for the proposed 15" pipe and the existing 12" RCP connector pipe replaced with a 15" pipe to the "E" Inlet in the County roadway.
5. Clarification shall be provided as to if the subsurface stormwater basin has been designed to have sufficient capacity for 150% of the 100 year storm. Provide the water surface elevation that will be seen within the subsurface stormwater basin.

6. The proposed Rip-Rap design calculations at the basin emergency spillway discharge shall be provided.
7. The stormwater management report, as well as the permeability tests provided, confirm that the soils are well suited to support a groundwater recharge system on site. Given the possibility of sinkhole development due to carbonate rock formation, the groundwater recharge requirement should be mitigated elsewhere to satisfy the requirements.
8. The stormwater management plan and maintenance responsibility for the subject property need to be unconditionally approved by the Washington Borough Land Use Board. Written confirmation of the approval needs to be provided to the County.

## COMMENTS

1. A Highway Access and Construction Permit will be required from the Warren County Engineer's Office for any work within the County Route #623 right of way.
2. A Highway Access and Construction Permit(s) will be required from the Warren County Engineer's Office for any utility work within the County Route #623 right of way by the respective utilities. Any revisions to the utilities shown on the plans will need to be resubmitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to permitting.

The County Road Site Plan report was accepted on a motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Urfer. Motion carried.

### **22-007-SP**

#### **Larken Associates, LLC**

Pohatcong  
Block 93, Lot 5.04  
High Street (CR 642)

Description: Preliminary/Final site plan in Pohatcong, Block 93 Lot 5.04 located on High Street CR 642. This is a residential site plan multi-family housing. Lot 5.04 is 8.87 acres. The project is proposing to construct 120 multifamily apartment units. This is located in the AH-Affordable Housing District.

Disapproved for the following reasons:

1. The existing physical centerline of the roadway shall be clearly shown and labeled. Dimension the right of way line from the centerline on all plan sheets.

2. The trip generation provided indicates both proposed driveways to be major driveways. County road widening shall be provided in accordance with County standard detail T6. The road improvement plans shall be at a scale of 1"=20' or 1"=30' in accordance with County standards and the entire length of widening shown. Label the centerline of the roadway and dimension the proposed edge of pavement 22 feet from the centerline. Dimension the 200 feet widening length and fifty feet transition length.
3. The Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan shall be updated once the proposed County road pavement widening is revised to meet County standards.
4. For the "County Road Widening Pavement Detail" on Sheet 24, the base course and surface course shall be noted to be minimum thicknesses (match existing) and all thicknesses shall be noted to be compacted thicknesses.
5. The following shall be addressed for the cross-sections in the vicinity of the proposed County road widening:
  - a. The cross sections shall be revised to show pavement widening on both sides of the roadway in accordance with County standards.
  - b. For the cross section at Stations 0+50, 7+50 and 8+00, the slope of the existing pavement is not consistent with the elevations and width provided.
  - c. The label for the cross section at Station 2+00 shall be corrected.
  - d. For the cross section at Stations 2+50 and 3+00, the slope of the proposed widening is not consistent with the elevations and width provided.
  - e. For the cross section at Station 4+00 through 7+00 and at Station 8+00, provide the dimension and slope between the sidewalk and curb and verify that the slope is not excessive.
6. Once design plans are completely finalized, the Township will need to execute an Agreement with the County in which the Township assumes responsibility for the ownership and maintenance of the sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks within the County right of way.
7. The proposed sight triangles shall be 30' x 100' measured along the road right of way lines in accordance with County standard detail T6. The details "Sight Triangle Easement West Entrance Detail" and "Sight Triangle Easement East Entrance Detail" and all applicable plan views shall be revised accordingly.
8. The County's standard sight triangle easement form is to be used for the 30' x 100' sight triangles. An 8 1/2" x 14" copy of the plan showing the dedications shall be attached to the deed. A copy of the draft deed needs to be submitted to the County Engineer's Office for approval prior to recording. The deed is to be recorded and returned to the Warren County Planning Department prior to approval.
9. Label the pavement radii at both proposed driveways.



10. Sightlines for both proposed major driveways shall be shown on a 20 or 30 scale plan. The major driveway classifications shall be noted on the plan. Sight line profiles shall be provided in accordance with County standards.
11. The previous response letter indicates that the testing done found the soils on site to be HSG D. The on-site soil reclassification shall be mentioned in the report along with an explanation on why the soils are being reclassified. Test results confirming the reclassification of soils shall be provided as well.
12. The Tc calculations determined in the stormwater report for the existing conditions shall be reviewed to ensure all inputs are correct. There are discrepancies with the flow lengths, manning's roughness coefficients, velocities, etc. that affect final Tc calculations. The direct entry Tc values for the existing condition hydrographs are not consistent to the values that have been calculated in the appendix.
13. The 100 year proposed runoff value has been input incorrectly in the table on page 6 of the introduction. The 100 year proposed runoff was calculated to be 27.2 cfs per the Stormwater Management Report and shall be revised accordingly.
14. The outlet pipe between Outlet Control Structure 33 and Headwall 34 are inconsistent between the plans and report. All plan sheets, details, and calculations applicable shall be revised accordingly.
15. The FES Rip Rap Design shall be recalculated as the inputs used in the formulas do not match the results calculated for the final design. When recalculating, note that Q and q are different values where Q represents discharge and q represents discharge per unit width. Refer to page 12-2 of the NJ SESC Manual.
16. Dimensions for the underground basin shall be clearly shown on the plan where applicable. The height of the underground basin from bottom of stone to top of stone shall be provided. If the dimension varies then it shall be noted on the underground basin detail as such.
17. The underground basin storage capacity calculations are inconsistent for different storm event hydrographs in the reports appendix. The 2, 10, and 100 year proposed conditions take into account that the 24" pipe storage volume takes away from the stone storage volume (18241 cf). The 2 and 10 year stability hydrographs do not account for the piping storage volume (21069 cf). The total underground storage capacity calculations shall be consistent throughout the report.
18. The underground basin storage calculations in the stormwater management report shows the invert elevation for the bottom of the basin and the 24" HDPE to be equal at 352.37'. The underground basin detail calls for 6" of cover between the bottom of the basin and the bottom of the 24" HDPE. Clarification shall be provided on what design will be utilized and

the proper revision shall be made where applicable. Please note that underdrains will be required if 6” of cover is necessary between the basin bottom and HDPE pipes to allow for any stormwater that travels to the bottom of the basin to be discharged towards Outlet Structure.

19. It is unclear how the underground basin will discharge to MH 26 and further downstream to OCS 27. A detail drawing similar to that of the Surface Detention Basin Section shall be included to provide clarity as to how the underground detention system operates.
20. The aboveground bioretention basin shall have sufficient storage to hold the WQDS runoff volume without overflow. The maximum depth of runoff for the WQDS in a bioretention system is 12” and on line systems shall set the lowest quantity control outlet at the water surface elevation of the WQDS. The basin shall be revised to meet the standard of the NJDEP BMP Manual.
21. The length of the emergency spillway is 30 feet on the plans and 40 feet in the Stormwater Management Report. Coordination between the two is needed and the information revised accordingly.
22. The stormwater management plan and maintenance responsibility for the subject property need to be unconditionally approved by the Township of Pohatcong Land Use Board. Confirmation of the approval needs to be provided to the County.
23. The percentage of the trip distribution assigned to County Route #641 (20%) which is not corroborated by the provided Existing 2022 weekday AM & PM peak hour traffic volumes. The percentages shall be adjusted accordingly and the LOS calculations run for the intersection of County Route #642 (High Street) and County Route #519 (3rd Street).
24. The submitted Traffic Impact Study for Larken Living at Pohatcong, Pohatcong Township, NJ prepared by McDonough & Rea Associates, Inc. dated January 24, 2023, last revised April 12, 2023 was reviewed. The enclosed May 18, 2023 review letter by WSP, the County traffic engineering consultant, shall be satisfactorily addressed.

## COMMENTS

1. A Highway Access and Construction Permit will be required from the Warren County Engineers Office for any improvements within the County Route #642 right of way.
2. A Highway Access and Construction Permit will be required from the Warren County Engineers Office for any utility work within the County Route #642 right of way.
3. The detention basin berm may be considered a Class IV Dam under New Jersey Dam Safety Standards. The applicant is hereby notified that Warren County will not accept responsibility for the dam structure or the review of subsequent inspection reports; the responsibility for these items must, therefore be assumed by the Municipality or the N.J.D.E.P.

The County Road Site Plan report was accepted on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Mr. Smith. Motion carried.

**21-009-SP****Hopatcong DD, LLC**

Blairstown

Block 703, Lots 1 &amp; 2

Buchanan Road (CR 674) and Route 94

Description: County road preliminary/final site plan to construct a new Dunkin Donuts coffee/donut shop with drive thru on a 1.6 acre site located at Block 703, Lots 1 and 2 in Blairstown Township. The site is located on County Route #674 (Buchanan Road) and NJSH 94. Existing access to the site will be replaced with proposed access from a new driveway on NJSH 94 and a new driveway on CR#674. The proposed project would include a one-floor building containing 2,502 square feet of commercial space, 18 new vehicular parking spaces, access drives, and stormwater management facilities. The project will include approximately 24,360 square feet of new impervious surface. The present use of the site is commercial/residential and existing structures will be removed to construct the project. The site is located in the HC (highway Commercial) Zone District.

Disapproved for the following reasons:

1. The draft deed for the sight triangle easement at the driveway access to County Route #674 was reviewed and is acceptable. The complete deed document is to be recorded at the office of the Warren County Clerk by the applicant and returned to the Warren County Planning Department prior to approval.
2. Since it was indicated improvements at the intersection of County Route #674 and Route #94 for realignment as noted by the Township are not to be installed, a fair share pro-rata contribution will be considered.
3. The draft deed for the right-of-way dedication for County Route #674 was reviewed and is acceptable. The complete deed document is to be recorded at the office of the Warren County Clerk by the applicant and returned to the Warren County Planning Department prior to approval.
4. The draft deed for the sight triangle easement along State Route #94 at the intersection with County Route #674 was reviewed and is acceptable. The complete deed document is to be recorded at the office of the Warren County Clerk by the applicant and returned to the Warren County Planning Department prior to approval.
5. In accordance with the County Development Review Regulations, Section 5.10.f. , a pro-rata fair share contribution towards the cost of improvement to the road segment of County Route #674 (Buchanan Road) shall be made pursuant to the formula therein. The calculation and resulting contribution amount shall be submitted to the County prior to final approval.

6. The stormwater management for the development needs to be unconditionally approved by the Township of Blairstown Land Use Board. Written confirmation of the approval by the Township needs to be provided to the County.
7. The final version of the Operation and Maintenance Manual for Stormwater Management Facilities once approved by the Township shall be provided to the County referencing the latest plan revision date in Part II, Item e.
8. A copy of the NJDOT permit, once issued, indicating approval by the NJDOT for the outlet structure discharge system connecting to the Route 94 drainage system to complete the proposed design shall be provided.

### COMMENTS

1. The sewerage disposal design and well abandonment must be approved by the Warren County Health Department.
2. A permit from the Warren County Shade Tree Commission will be needed for the removal of any trees that are 8" or greater in diameter, within the County right-of-way.
3. A copy of the access permit and drainage permit from the New Jersey Department of Transportation for the proposed improvements within the Route #94 right of way shall be provided.
4. A Highway Access and Construction Permit will be required from the Warren County Engineer's Office for any work within the County Route #674 right of way.
5. The detention basin berm may be considered a Class IV Dam under New Jersey Dam Safety Standards. The applicant is hereby notified that Warren County will not accept responsibility for the dam structure or the review of subsequent inspection reports; the responsibility for these items must, therefore be assumed by the Municipality or the N.J.D.E.P.

### EXEMPT

Noted and Accepted.

23-011-SP	Hackettstown	ST FRA Stiger, LLC	04/19/23
23-013-SP	Phillipsburg	R Amos Real Estate, LLC	05/08/23

**TIME EXTENSIONS**

A time extension of 60 days was approved by the Warren County Planning Board for file number 21-034-SP on a motion by Mr. Urfer, seconded by Ms. Meuse.

21-034-SP                      Pohatcong                      Paul Matinho/NJ Battery Energy Storage Project

Description: County Road Site plan located on CR # 519 in Pohatcong Township. The applicant is proposing a Battery Storage Facility on Block 105 Lot 1. This is an abandon industrial site. The battery storage, to store electricity. The site plan has 5,135 square feet of impervious surface. The site is located in the Industrial Zone.

TN/

Proofread          RPC