



MEMORANDUM

Clarke Caton Hintz

Architects
Planners
Landscape Architects

100 Barrack Street
Trenton NJ 08608
clarkecatonhintz.com
Tel: 609 883 8383
Fax: 609 883 4044

To: Union Township Planning Board/Zoning Board of Adjustment
From: Andrea Malcolm, PP, AICP 
Re: **Brian Plushanski**
Concept Plan Review
Block 22, Lots 3 & 4
Frontage Road
VC – Village Commercial
Date: June 5, 2020

As requested by the Board, this informal review provides comments on the Concept Plan prepared by William Salmon, PE of PS&S (two sheets, dated April 6, 2020). The plan depicts a 21.18 acre tract comprised of existing lot 3 and proposed lots 4.01 and 4.02, for a total of 3 lots. An office/warehouse building is proposed on each of the 3 lots.

1. Use Variance(s). The plans label each of the buildings as an “office/warehouse”; however, the proposed buildings on lots 4.01 and 4.02 are primarily comprised of warehouse space. The applicant should clarify the proposed use(s) at the site. As the VC zone does not include an “office/warehouse” as a permitted use, a “d(1)” use variance appears to be required. We defer to the Board Attorney for comment regarding concept plan review of a development that requires a use variance(s).
2. FAR and Bulk Variances. Per the zoning table, proposed Lot 4.01 would have an FAR of 0.137, exceeding the maximum 0.125 FAR permitted in the VC zone. As such, a “d(4)” FAR variance is required. In addition, impervious coverage variances are required on all 3 lots, and building coverage variances are required on proposed Lots 4.01 and 4.02. The extent of the proposed development should be reduced to eliminate and/or reduce the extent of the variances.
3. Subdivision Design/Development Layout. The proposed subdivision design results in a more spread out development, contributing to the need for variances. The applicant should indicate the feasibility of a more consolidated, and better integrated, development layout on one lot. Reorienting the buildings in a north-south direction (with narrow end facing Frontage Road) should also be considered as this may enhance circulation.

Philip Caton, FAICP
John Hatch, FAIA
George Hibbs, AIA
Brian Slauch, AICP
Michael Sullivan, AICP

Emeriti
John Clarke, FAIA
Carl Hintz, AICP, ASLA



4. Existing Development. Tax records indicate existing dwelling(s) on the property, and the plans depict an existing metal building. The applicant should indicate the disposition of any existing development at the site.
5. Access/Circulation.
 - a. The plans depict the construction of a private right-of-way along the east side of the tract that would be partially located on the Transco gas pipeline easement. As it is not clear if Transco would permit this, the applicant should indicate what alternative designs for site access have been considered.
 - b. The proximity of the new private road access to the adjacent lot and to existing and proposed driveways along Frontage Road, where sight distance may be limited, is a concern.
 - c. The applicant should clarify the proposed use of the paved areas to the rear of the buildings on proposed lots 4.01 and 4.02, including the extent of loading operations and truck traffic at the site. The proximity of the lot 4.02 loading area to the adjacent residential property is a concern.
 - d. No pedestrian circulation is depicted. How would pedestrians access the building from the parking area on the east side of lot 4.02?
6. Natural Resources. Calculations provided by the applicant indicate that the proposed disturbance of steep slopes would exceed the maximum permitted disturbance of this natural resource in all three categories (10 – 15%, >15 – 20%, and >20%). A calculation of the minimum required resource protection for wildlife habitats and for woodlands associations should also be provided. The applicant should indicate what alternative designs have been considered that would reduce the loss of natural resources at the site.
7. Landscape Buffer. A minimum 50' landscape buffer is required along the southern tract perimeter which is bordered by the VR zone (Fallone development) and along the western perimeter, where there is an adjacent residential property. The proposed development on Lot 4.02 is in close proximity to both the southern and western property line; the plan should be revised to eliminate any encroachment within the required buffer.

c: Grace Kocher, Board Secretary
Mark Anderson, Esq.
Robert Clerico PE

Brian Plushanski
William Salmon, PE