



Township of Hillsborough Environmental Commission

PLANNING & ZONING DEPARTMENT
THE PETER J. BIONDI MUNICIPAL BUILDING
379 SOUTH BRANCH ROAD
HILLSBOROUGH, NJ 08844
www.hillsborough-nj.org
(908) 369-4313

To: Carl Suraci, Chairman, Hillsborough Township Planning Board

Date: May 11, 2022

Subject: Homestead Road, LLC – File 21-PB-25-MS/MSPV – Block 200.10, Lots 32 & 33 – 203 Homestead Road and 189 Homestead Road

The applicant attended the March 28, 2022 Environmental Commission (EC) meeting. Applicant seeking preliminary and final major subdivision approval; preliminary and final major site plan approval; and waivers, to consolidate the two lots and then subdivide into two reconfigured lots; and demolish all existing structures to construct two warehouse/office buildings, with associated stormwater, parking, and site improvements, on Property in the TECD, Transitional Economic Development District. Mr. Mike Ford (Van Cleef Engineering), Matt Flynn, Esq. (Sava, Schalla Inc.) and Edward Kuc (Eastern States Environmental Associates, Inc.) were in attendance and represented the applicant.

The following items were presented by the applicant's representatives:

- Lot 33: Existing = 20.38 acres. Proposed = 49.10 acres
- Lot 32: Existing = 68.07 acres. Proposed = 39.35 acres
- There is an existing single-family dwelling on the parcel.
- The property includes freshwater wetlands, stream corridors, floodplains and a pipeline easement.
- Total acreage consists of approximately 88 acres. The proposal will disturb less than half.
- There are 2 proposed driveway crossings of the Tributary to Royce Brook stream corridor. The crossings will include utilities. Need 2 crossings for emergency access to rear of proposed building.
- The tributary has a drainage area greater than 50 acres.
- Proposed outlets from 3 stormwater basins into stream corridor.
- Township sanitary sewer within stream corridor.
- Proposal includes 2 bio-retention basins and 1 infiltration basin, and a Filterra Device (separate from bio-retention basins).
- Porous pavement and 6 mechanical treatment devices (MTDs) proposed in parking areas, not in the travel way. Plastic Grid approved for water loading (empty trailer area).
- Applicant submitted for a Somerset-Union Soil Conservation District Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Certification, Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission approval, and NJDEP Freshwater Wetland Letter of Interpretation.
- Applicant will submit for a NJDEP Freshwater Wetland Permit and NJDEP Flood Hazard Area Permit.

- Applicant stated that existing tree disturbance will be minimized. The project proposes to remove 161 trees. 460 trees are required to be planted and 305 will be planted. A Conservation Easement is proposed for the new tree plantings. The remaining 155 trees will be compensated by the applicant by a monetary contribution to the town's tree fund.
- Applicant requests a variance for a 30' wide driveway.
- Stormwater analysis provided by applicant. 2, 10, 100-year storm:
 - 2-yr storm: 14 cfs allowed; 6 cfs proposed
 - 10-yr storm: 46 cfs allowed; 20 cfs proposed
 - 100-yr storm: 106 cfs allowed; 89 cfs proposed
- Using mapped soils for stormwater calculations. C & D Soils on-site.
- The applicant's Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) is David Robinson (Synergy).
- Lot 33: Responsible Party is the current property owner, with the buyer to take over. The project is going through ISRA (for waste management operations - septic tanks and related services). 25 Areas of Concern (AOCs) have been identified by the LSRP on-site of which 16 have been preliminarily designated as requiring no further investigation. Additional AOCs require additional investigation. 1 soil sample conducted which had metal exceedances; looking at compliance averaging. An ISRA Preliminary Assessment is currently underway. If not completed before sale, Remediation Agreement will be signed and funded. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was also prepared for the property. To date, the EC has not received a copy of the Phase I ESA for review.
- Lot 32: Was an "Old Pig Farm". Has a Texas Eastern Pipeline easement. Applicant stated that the Preliminary Assessment Site Investigation will be submitted to the town when complete (approx. August 2022).
- Lot 32.01: Residential. Not part of application.
- The applicant's "Ecological Resources Inventory and Impact Assessment Report" dated Dec. 10, 2021 identified the Tributary of Royce Brook as Freshwater 2 – non-trout (FW2-NT). However, it did not address TMDL requirements. The report stated that no critical habitat as listed by the USFWS is located within the project site.

The EC conducted a site visit on April 14, 2022:

- Existing stormwater from the existing construction yard discharges down the hill towards the tributary. There is a cut on the east side of the paved area that appears to direct stormwater flow downhill.
- EC members noted the steep slopes along the eastern boundary of the existing developed portion of Lot 33. It was noted that the hill is being eroded to do lack of stormwater management.
- The neighborhood could be seen behind the site. Based on this the EC recommends lighting restrictions for the portions of the buildings that face towards the homes. The site is a good amount higher in elevation than the adjacent neighborhood to the north.
- Recommend that all debris currently on-site (i.e., school buses, dilapidated structures, etc.) be removed prior to construction, even if outside of the proposed developed portions of the site.

- The EC has not received a copy of the Phase I ESA Report and therefore a review of the identified Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs)/AOCs could not be completed while on-site.

The EC has the following comments/recommendations:

- Concern of tractor trailers on porous pavement.
- O&M SWM Manual should add tree replacements.
- 5.7M gallons of stormwater runoff – existing condition. 7.08M gallons stormwater runoff – proposed condition
- The project is a “major development” and must comply with the NJDEP Stormwater Management Rules (NJAC 7:8).
- The applicant needs to provide Hillsborough Stream Corridor Ordinance Waiver justification and documentation for 2 proposed stream crossings. Stream Corridor also includes all immediately adjacent lands with slopes greater than 10%. Plans need to reflect as such.
- The applicant needs to provide documentation determining whether the tree clearing is more or less than 60%, as per town ordinance.
- Recommend the applicant go before the Hillsborough Township Historic Commission as the property is located within the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible “Inch Lines Linear Multistate Historic District” and also within the Hillsborough-Pleasant View Historic District (NRHP-Identified) and 201 Homestead Road is designated as an NRHP-Identified Individual Resource.
- 189 Homestead Road (Lot 33) is listed as a NJDEP Known Contaminated Site.
- EC requests a copy of the Phase I ESA Report.
- Filterra Device: replacement of trees and vegetation not noted in O&M Manual and there is a concern with the trees dying.
- Pre-development existing conditions has stormwater flow of 100-year at 8.2”. In the proposed condition an extra 1.4M gallons of water leaving the site within 24 hours of storm. Extra volume holding not required by regulation. Preference to hold water for 36-48 hours, though regulation only requires 24 hours of retention. Applicant is meeting the applicable state requirements.
- All NJDEP submittals and approvals are to be copied to the Hillsborough Township Planning Board. Also, the Hillsborough Clerk is to receive a full copy of all permit application packages submitted by the applicant to NJDEP as per state regulations.
- The Royce Brook tributary at this location is impaired for TSS. TMDL exists for Royce Brook, which includes a requirement to reduce TSS to <60% for agricultural and urban land. Applicant to sample the tributaries weekly upstream and downstream during construction. Water Quality Sampling Plan to be submitted to the EC.
- NJDEP and USFWS tree clearing restrictions for protected species (ex. northern long-eared bat, etc.) to be adhered to.

Comments from the public:

1. Brian Tarantino, 235 Fairfield Lane
 - Noise concerns, adjacent to residents. Requests noise abatement from trucks.
 - Air quality concerns, including from trucks emissions.
 - Traffic Study concerns. Only 7 morning truck trips? Only 11 evening truck trips? Totaling only 18 daily truck trips? According to Traffic Study, could be 900 truck trips/day. 0.5 truck trips / 1,000 square foot warehouse = 286 truck trips/day.

- Concern of maintaining roads due to heavy truck usage.
2. Susan Gulliford
 - Lighting not addressed.
 - Areas of Concern in stream.
 - Safety concern about oil spills in truck parking areas.
 - Will the tractor-trailers have oil-spill kits? Will there be a Filterra MTD? What is the protocol for spills?
 3. Mr. Bolar, 47 Winding Way
 - Adjacent neighbor
 - Concerned about flooding.
 - Concerned about noise pollution. Current operations of only 4 trucks is already loud.
 4. Mrs. Edith Pidihes, 51 Winding Way
 - Has concerns about air & noise pollution, light pollution and flooding.
 - Wouldn't be able to enjoy her property if proposed development is constructed.
 5. Craig Berlin, 1 Allshouse Street (corner of Willow and Amwell)
 - Noise concerns from trucks. How will traffic be routed from site to highway?
 - What is the combined effect (noise, traffic) of this application and other forthcoming warehouse applications?
 - Can truck traffic be mitigated?
 6. J. Melecki, 31 White Meadow Road
 - Adjacent to northern portion of site.
 - Concern about noise, light and visual impacts.
 - Who will be the tenant in these warehouses? (Applicant responded that the tenant is not yet known but they feel comfortable that a tenant will be relatively easy to find due to the current market for warehouses.)
 - Traffic to high school on same road as applicant. 1-way trip to high school along Homestead Road. Safety concern about students using Homestead Road to get to school with large trucks also utilizing Homestead Road.
 - Need truck traffic timing restrictions.
 7. Rich Gahrman, 53 Winding Way
 - Owns property right up to stream in southeast portion of proposed development.
 - Flooding concerns. This stream as steep embankments, so also has associated erosion concerns.
 - MVA clearing along and in stream.
 - Concern about proposed 572 parking spots.
 - Lot 33 is elevated about 100' higher than surrounding residential area.
 - Property value concerns.
 8. Tackach, 52 Winding Way
 - Visual / light concerns.
 - Truck traffic concerns.
 - Light and noise concerns.

- Hours of operation concerns.
 - Surrounding neighbors ground elevation at about 70', proposal ground elevation at about 100', plus 40' high proposed buildings. So the proposed project will be 70-80 feet higher in elevation than surrounding residents.
 - Line-of-sight concerns.
9. William Martin, 237 Hillsborough Road
- Only access along Homestead Road.
 - Are there any limitations west along Homestead Road?
 - Railroad and stream bridge strength of Homestead Road to match.
10. Lanahan, 43 Winding Way
- Truck traffic – aggregate concern.
 - Believes town can stop developments.
 - Quality of life concerns.
 - Noise and light pollution concerns.
 - Taxpayer concerns.
 - Can township limit truck traffic in residential areas? Limit hours of operation. Limit traffic during school bus hours.
 - Recommend hours of operation for lights and foot candles.
11. Sophie Globier, The Watershed Institute
- Supports Dr. Obropta's comments regarding concern about flooding issues.
 - Requests applicant to go above and beyond regarding stormwater retention and flooding.
 - Requests water quality and sedimentation sampling during construction of the on-site waterways.
12. David Brook, 7 Winding Way
- Stated that this application is an incompatible land use.
 - Stated that the proposed project is within an industrial zone, as required, but believes it can be re-zoned for a better, more consistent use.
 - Lots of restrictions on this property (ex. pipeline, wetlands, streams, etc.).
 - EC to mention incompatible use.
 - Visual impacts.
 - Traffic flow. Does applicant propose to widen Homestead Road? Proposed traffic is a major issue.
 - What will be the hours of operation?
 - Will applicant only access property from Route 206?
 - Sewer: Is property in the "sewer service area"? (Applicant responded "Yes").
 - Where are the deed restrictions located?
 - Can the applicant make all stormwater basins recharge and not detention?
 - Can applicant create more freshwater wetlands?
 - Traffic impacts surrounding residential neighborhoods, including those neighborhoods not immediately adjacent to proposed development (ex. Allhouse Street, Willow, and Amwell neighborhoods).
 - Traffic Study should include existing and proposed Levels of Service along Amwell Road, Willow Road, and Hillsborough Road.

13. John Shockley, 203 Homestead Road (owner of current lots subject of application)
 - Newer trucks are quieter and cleaner.
 - 8'6" legal truck width.
 - Sympathizes with adjacent residents. However, proposed development is allowed as per current zoning. Public should use their energy to seek re-zoning of areas of future concerns.
14. Robert Harris, 13 Hunt Club Road
 - Application is to the detriment of the surrounding neighborhoods.
15. Tony Galuppo, 44 Franklin Drive
 - Trucker phone app gives truckers directions, so truck traffic will be dictated by "apps".
 - Negative impact to town.
 - Will this set precedent for warehouses near residences?
 - Concern the land is going from woods to warehouses.
 - Noise concern: what does study compare noise to?
 - Concerns regarding light and hours of operation.

The Commission reserves the right to provide additional comments should more information become available.

Sincerely,

Michael Folli

Michael Folli
Chairman, Hillsborough Township Environmental Commission

Cc: Hillsborough Environmental Commission, Hillsborough Planning Office