

1.

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323
January 28, 2010

The Reorganization/Regular meeting of the Florence Township Planning Board was held on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Solicitor David Frank called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Solicitor Frank then read the following statement: "I would like to announce that this meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice has been provided and posted in the main hall of the municipal complex."

Upon roll call the following members were found to be present:

Mayor Bill Berry	Paul Ostrander
Mildred J. Hamilton-Wood	Councilman Sean P. Ryan
James Molimock	Charles Bauer
Wayne Morris	

ABSENT: Timothy Lutz
Frederick Wainwright

ALSO PRESENT: David Frank, Esquire
Dante Guzzi, PE
Joseph Petrongolo, PP

Solicitor Frank administered the oath of office to Wayne Morris (Class II – 1 year term), Paul Ostrander (unexpired Class IV term – 12-31-11), Mildred Hamilton-Wood (Class IV – 4 year term), Charles Bauer (unexpired Alternate No. 2 – 12-31-10). Frederick Wainwright Alternate No. 1 is absent but will be sworn in at the next meeting.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Solicitor Frank called for nominations for Chairperson of the Board.

Motion of Berry, seconded by Ryan to nominate Mildred Hamilton-Wood as Chairperson of the Board. Hearing no further nominations motion was made by Ryan, seconded by Berry to close the nominations. Motion unanimously approved by all members present. The Board voted unanimously to elect Mildred Hamilton-Wood as Chairperson. Ms. Hamilton-Wood thanked the Board and was seated as Chairperson.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood opened nominations for Vice Chairman. Motion of Berry, seconded by Ostrander to nominate Tim Lutz as Vice Chairman. There being no further nominations, motion was made by Berry and seconded by Morris to close the nominations. The Board voted unanimously to elect Mr. Lutz as Vice Chairman.

2.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called for nominations for Board Secretary. Motion of Berry, seconded by Molimock to nominate Paul Ostrander. There being no further nominations motion was made and seconded to close nominations. The Board voted unanimously to elect Paul Ostrander as Board Secretary.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called for nominations for Board Clerk. Motion of Berry, seconded by Morris to nominate Nancy Erlston as Board Clerk. There being no further nominations motion was made by Ryan, seconded by Berry to close nominations. The Board voted unanimously to elect Nancy Erlston as Board Clerk.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called for the appointment of the professional staff.

Motion of Berry, seconded by Morris to nominate David Frank as Board Solicitor, Dan Guzzi as Board Engineer and Joseph Petrongolo as Board Planner. There being no further nominations motion was made by Berry, seconded by Molimock to close nominations. The Board voted unanimously to appoint the professionals as stated.

Engineer Guzzi and Planner Petrongolo were sworn in by Solicitor Frank as experts for the year of 2010.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution PB-2010-01
Appointment of the Planning Board Solicitor, Engineer and Planner

Resolution PB-2010-02
Establishing annual schedule of regular meetings and other policies relating to the New Jersey Open Public meetings Act.

Resolution PB-2010-03
Readopting the Florence Township Planning Board Administrative Rules.

Motion of Berry, seconded by Molimock to approve Resolutions PB-2010-01, PB-2010-02 and PB-2010-03.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Berry, Hamilton-Wood, Molimock, Morris, Ryan, Ostrander, Bauer
NOES: None
ABSENT: Lutz, Wainwright

MINUTES

Motion of Berry, seconded by Morris to approve the Minutes from the regular meeting of December 21, 2009 as submitted. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

3.

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Review letter from Engineer Guzzi dated December 16, 2009, regarding Church of Saints Francis and Clare, Block 145, Lot 1.
- B. Letter from Burlington County Soil Conservation District dated December 24, 2009, regarding Church of Saints Francis and Clare.
- C. Letter from Richard A. Alaimo Associates dated December 29, 2009 regarding Treatment Works Approval Application for New Belt Filter Press.
- D. Letter from Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders dated January 5, 2010 regarding Community Development Block Grant Program Planning.
- E. Letter from Burlington County Planning Board dated January 4, 2010 regarding Estates at Oak Mills, Phase 1 Subdivision.
- F. Registration form for NJPO 2010 Winter-Spring Mandatory Training Seminar.
- G. Review letter from Planner Petrongolo dated January 27, 2010 regarding Church of Saints Francis and Clare.

Motion of Berry, seconded by Molimock to receive and file Correspondence A through G. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called for Application PB#2009-07 for Whitesell Construction Co., Inc. Applicant is requesting Minor Subdivision and Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval for property located at 290 Daniels Way. Block 158, Lot 1 (proposed Lot 1.01).

Lynn Blessing McDougall, attorney representing Whitesell Construction Co. stated that this application had been started in October. The application was deemed incomplete pending an update of the Traffic Study, which has been submitted. Engineer Guzzi generated a review letter to which Terrance Huettl, who remains under oath from the October meeting, responded to in writing.

Engineer Guzzi said that the one item for completeness from the October meeting was the submission of the traffic study. The Board may recall that they did not grant that waiver as requested. He stated that a traffic study had been submitted and reviewed. Engineer Guzzi said that he thought there had been a misunderstanding. The original traffic study had been completed for the entire Haines Center Complex approximately 10 years ago. In 2004 it was updated with projections that went through 2008. He stated that it was his understanding that the Board was anticipating a further update of that general traffic study, similar to the 2004 update. What was actually submitted was a study analyzing the impact just of this particular proposal for 290 Daniels Way. Engineer Guzzi stated that in

4.

his review he had asked for some indication as to when that update of the initial study could be expected. A letter had been received from Mr. Huettl stating that he did not think that the Board's intent was to have an update of that initial study.

Mr. Huettl said that the original Traffic Impact Report for this site dates back to 1998. They had prepared a very large report and it was prepared for multiple jurisdictions. The report was submitted to Burlington Township, and the Burlington County Land Development Board as well as New Jersey Department of Transportation. A later version was submitted to Florence Township in 2001. Whitesell was trying to do a single report that met everyone's requirements so they were very detailed.

Mr. Huettl stated that at this time they have not submitted an updated report to Burlington Township since 2004 and the County has not received one since 2001. That master traffic plan had not been updated in several years because nobody was requiring it. He said that when they were before the Board in October there was discussion not only of the previous reports but also the specific traffic impact of this building. Mr. Huettl said that he had provided a fair amount of testimony regarding how much traffic would be generated by the subject building. He said that when he left the meeting in October it was his understanding that the Board wanted a traffic impact report for the building that they were applying for. That is what was submitted. He stated that he did not have the impression that the Board wanted a report that would discuss other buildings that the subject of the application.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said that she didn't know how the Board could know what the traffic is with one building without taking into account the traffic as a whole. Engineer Guzzi stated that the submitted traffic study did take into consideration the other existing developments and some of the proposed developments. It was not an analysis of the overall development and not as far reaching.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said that one of the concerns that the Board always has is the Route 130/Cedar Lane intersection because of the school. Engineer Guzzi stated that the submitted study stops at John Galt Way and Route 130.

Mr. Huettl said that the codebook of Florence doesn't give much direction to establishing the scope for traffic impact studies, so Whitesell used the NJDOT standards for determining what the scope should be. According to the NJDOT standards a traffic impact report needs to follow the development upstream in the traffic network to a point where the sites traffic is less than 100 peak hour trips and that is what Whitesell did.

Mr. Huettl said that based on the size of the building that is proposed and the trips that are generated by it, no intersections required studies based on NJDOT standards because the building doesn't generate 100 peak hour trips. Whitesell took the investigation much further than the NJDOT standards would have dictated and analyzed all the intersections within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile of the site.

5.

Engineer Guzzi stated that the applicant technically met the submission requirement because they did submit a traffic study so the application can be deemed complete.

Mr. Huettl said that the traffic study included brand new counts from the end of 2009. It included all of the existing traffic from Whitesell's buildings and anything else that is built in the area. A count was done for other future projects that have been approved but not built in both Burlington and Florence Townships. They also included almost 1,000,000 sq. ft. of future development by Whitesell in addition to the 132,000 sq. ft. that is part of this application tonight.

Solicitor Frank stated that he recalled that Mr. Huettl himself proposed that the updated traffic study be done at some point, but due to the smaller size of this building that a full blown study be postponed.

Mr. Huettl said that he did recall a discussion along those lines. However, referring to the Resolution PB-2009-27 from the October 19, 2009 meeting he read: "be it further resolved that the preliminary and final major site plan application hearing be and hereby is adjourned to the meeting on January 28, 2010 pending the submission of a revised traffic impact study in accordance with the Board Engineer's recommendation."

Engineer Guzzi said that paragraph 9 on page 3 says "the Board adopts Mr. Guzzi's recommendations concerning submission waivers notably since the latest update to the 1998 traffic study for the initial development of the center provides data and analysis through 2008 only and there has been considerable development constructed and approved, a new traffic study should be prepared addressing the existing and anticipated conditions.

Mr. Huettl said that as Mr. Guzzi just read it says that there has been considerable development constructed and approved. A new traffic report should be prepared addressing the existing and anticipated conditions. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said that the paragraph that Mr. Huettl had read referenced a revised traffic study. The word "revised" seems to indicate that the Board was looking for an update on a prior traffic study.

Mayor Berry said that his recollection was that the Board wanted an updated traffic impact study. This would be a revision to the old study but would take into consideration all of the new elements and projects that had happened in the area. Mr. Huettl said that his report did take into consideration the new traffic counts. Traffic from the new school is included and traffic from all approved but not yet built sites. Mr. Huettl said that they did not analyze intersections. Engineer Guzzi said that the submitted traffic study stopped at John Galt Way whereas the original study went further down Route 130.

The Board had a discussion regarding what the scope of the traffic study should be.

Solicitor Frank stated that with regards to completeness the traffic study has been submitted. It remains to be seen if the information that has been submitted is sufficient to

6.

allow the Board to make an informed decision based upon ordinance standards. If the Board's experts say that they need more data the Board can ask for that.

Motion of Ryan, seconded by Berry to deem the application complete and open the public hearing.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Berry, Hamilton-Wood, Molimock, Morris, Ostrander, Ryan, Bauer
NOES: None
ABSENT: Lutz, Wainwright

Engineer Guzzi stated that the update of the overall traffic report is something that should be resolved with the applicant. One of the things to keep in mind is that the Board has historically relied upon this traffic impact study similar to the environmental impact study for the overall development so that as Whitesell comes in with applications for site plans or subdivisions we don't have to complete an individual traffic study for each one of the applications. If an update isn't done then a new study will be required for every application brought before the Board.

Mr. Huettl stated that technically, Whitesell did submit an update for every application that has been approved by this Board for the Haines Center project. They did submit the master plan study, but every subsequent application that they have made has included an update that talked about the specific traffic generation from that project. This project like those others did have an update, but apparently the Board found that to be inadequate.

Engineer Guzzi stated that those brief updates had the master plan study behind it. The master plan study projections lapsed in 2008. The Board thought that the master plan study would be updated and Whitesell would continue on as they have for the past 10 years.

Mr. Huettl said that he just wanted to emphasize that the original report was made for several jurisdictions. It was submitted to the NJDOT, Burlington County, Burlington Township and Florence Township. The assessment of intersections of Cedar Lane and Florence Columbus Road were put there for the NJDOT because those intersections fall within their jurisdiction. The county was interested in those because Route 130 intersects with county roads. These reports were not submitted to meet any requirements of Florence Township. In fact the Florence Township code doesn't have any requirements that those intersections be analyzed. There are no guidelines whatsoever for the content of a traffic impact report.

Mr. Huettl said that the traffic report that Whitesell submitted last month had brand new traffic counts. So all the counts from the new school and any development that has occurred prior to last fall is already in there. On top of that Whitesell included roughly a million square feet of future development from Whitesell. This is a valid and current traffic study.

7.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that the traffic counts that were taken were done in August. This was before school was in session and it is a heavy vacation time for people.

Planner Petrongolo stated that he had not received or reviewed the new traffic report. He stated that it was his recollection that the master document was going to be updated with projection through some date in the future.

Mayor Berry said that his impression was that the original master plan traffic study would be updated. The revision would include the scope of everything that was included in that study.

Mr. Huettl said that the building that is currently proposed is 132,000 sq. ft. It generates very little traffic. If you look at the report that was submitted it indicates that the peak hour traffic north of John Galt Way on Rt. 130 is 8 vehicles. So 8 vehicles would pass through Cedar Lane during the busiest hour from this application. There is very little impact. Whitesell would be happy to do a new traffic report that analyzes Cedar Lane with their next project that should be submitted mid to late spring 2010. For this project Whitesell did what they thought the Board wanted, certainly more than what the ordinance required.

Engineer Guzzi asked when the revision of the master traffic study would be done. Mr. Huettl said that they would be submitting another application in May or June 2010 and would be updating the traffic study at that time. The revised report will contain traffic from everything that has been approved and built at the Haines Center, in addition to what is proposed in Florence and in Burlington. If the traffic counts that were done in 2009 were completed when school was not in session then new counts will be done. Engineer Guzzi said the concerns from the Board's perspective are the intersections of Florence Columbus Road and Rt. 130 and Cedar Lane and Rt. 130.

Mr. Huettl said that he would comply with the comments made by Director of Water and Sewer, David Lebak on his review letter dated September 25, 2009. He said Whitesell would also comply with the comments on the October 15, 2009 review letter from the Fire District.

Engineer Guzzi asked Mr. Huettl to provide an overview of the project for the Board. Mr. Huettl submitted a plan illustrating the Haines Industrial Center. The site for the proposed building is at the intersection of John Galt Way and Daniels Way. The address of the building will be 290 Daniels Way. This is a 10 acre site and the proposal is for a 132,000 sq. ft. building. This would be the smallest building that Whitesell has built in Florence and is different than the other buildings as it is intended to be a multi-tenant building. This building is designed to accommodate up to 4 tenants. This building will have 4 entrances across the front. There will be windows across the front of the building and it will look like an office building. It is intended that the users would have offices in the front and warehousing in the back. The car parking is up front with a little bit of future parking to the side. There is a separate driveway for the trailer loading which is

8.

located at the back of the facility. This driveway is connected to another driveway on Daniels Way, which allows a circular traffic flow for the trucks. Also proposed is a row of trailer storage stalls in the back. Distribution facility users have a demand for this type of temporary storage. 61 trailer stalls have been provided to accommodate these needs.

Solicitor Frank marked the exhibits as follows: Exhibit 1-28-10A1 which is a colored master plan of the entire center dated January 29, 2009. Exhibit 1-28-10A2 is a site plan dated September 8, 2009.

Member Morris asked if the testimony was that this site would generate 8 cars per hour. Mr. Huettl stated that using ITE (Institute of Traffic Engineers) standards this site is anticipated to generate 8 trips during the peak hour (the busiest time of the day). In this case that would be from 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. or 4:15 p.m. to 5:15 p.m. The number of 8 vehicles would be the number of trips that would be north of John Galt Way on Route 130 during the peak hours.

Member Morris asked if this is based on the building having 4 tenants? Mr. Huettl said that the number of tenants doesn't play a role in the ITE calculations. It is based on the square footage and the type of building. Mr. Huettl stated as a side note that Whitesell did take the square footage that they had from 2009 and calculated what the real traffic generation is from the 3 buildings that are occupied at the Haines Center at Florence and they determined that the actual traffic generated is approximately half of the traffic that is estimated using the ITE rates. This information is included in the report.

Engineer Guzzi referred to his October 8, 2009 letter. He stated that the completeness items have already been addressed.

Item 1 is regarding the subdivision.

Item 2 regarding the existing gravel fire lane in the back of the site. Mr. Huettl stated that this would be relocated so that it no longer crosses the fire lane.

Item 3 regarding the requirement for curbing around parking areas. A design waiver would be required. Mr. Huettl stated that there is extensive curbing proposed for this plan. All of the driveways are curbed and the front parking lot is curbed on both sides. The only areas that are not curbed on the site are the back edge of the trailer parking area and the throat of the driveway that comes up the back. The areas that are not curbed are straight line areas or areas where the water runoff flows away from that edge of pavement so there is no need for curbing to direct water runoff. He stated that Whitesell would prefer to not have these areas curbed. This waiver would be similar to waivers granted for the other 5 buildings that Whitesell has had approved in this park. Engineer Guzzi stated that this Board has granted this same waiver for other applications and he sees no problem with granting it for this application.

Item 4 regarding parking stall size – 9' x 18' proposed where 10' x 20' is required and a design waiver would be required.

9.

Mr. Huettl stated that he would like to first address Item 5 regarding barrier free parking spaces. ADA requires that handicap parking stalls must be 20' long. Whitesell has proposed handicapped parking stalls at the entrance to the building. What they would like to do is to push the parking lot forward slightly towards Daniels Way. This would give 2' additional pavement across the front so that all the parking stalls across the front of the building would be 20' long. The stalls on opposite side of the drive aisle from the building would be proposed as 18' long. All of the proposed stalls are 10' wide none of the stalls are proposed at 9'. This change is not made to increase the number of parking spaces but will save 2' of pavement, it results in a saving of natural resources, less runoff and provides for more green space. Engineer Guzzi stated that he has no problem with this.

Planner Petrongolo stated that Item 6 refers to the ordinance requires a 75' parking setback. Right now the plan is for 30'. If the opposite side spaces are kept at 18' it would help to offset the variance.

Engineer Guzzi said that we have addressed Items 4 and 5 and Planner Petrongolo touched on Item 6. Mr. Huettl stated that the General Manufacturing zone requires a 75' wide setback. This is included to achieve some aesthetic balances in an industrial area. Not all industrial buildings look as good as Whitesell's. Having the larger setback makes things look nicer. This requirement is burdensome for a corner lot like this one. Whitesell is proposing a setback of over 80' on the John Galt Way side of the site and 28' along the secondary street, Daniels Way. This frontage along Daniels Way will not look like a typical industrial area. It will be a car parking lot in front of a building that will have windows all the way across the front. The building will be made of a combination of masonry and steel siding. This will look like an office building.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that her only concern was about drainage. Engineer Guzzi stated that drainage should not be an issue.

Item 7 regarding loading spaces. The requirement is for 15' wide where 13' 4" is proposed. Mr. Huettl stated that Whitesell owns approximately 90 buildings. There are approximately 270 tenants. The majority of those tenants are industrial users. Whitesell has been in this business for over 50 years and knows the demands of their users quite well. 15' is excessively wide and 40' is too short. Whitesell is proposing a narrower but longer trailer docking area. Using 13' 4" allows Whitesell to put 3 docking stations along their standard 40' bay. This works very well and maximizes that number of loading stalls on the building.

Item 8 regarding signs. One sign is permitted and 2 signs are proposed. Additionally a waiver is required for the freestanding sign height. 6' is the maximum and 7' is proposed. Mr. Huettl said that Whitesell intends to revise the plan to eliminate one of the signs. There is an existing sign on the corner of John Galt Way and Daniels Way. This is a directional sign that directed people to the buildings that were further back during the construction phase. Now that the buildings are built they are easy to find so this sign is

10.

no longer required and will be removed. So there will only be one sign and a variance will not be necessary for number of signs. A variance is being requested for the height of the sign. The proposed sign is 7' tall where 6' is permitted. Whitesell has been using the same shaped sign for 50 years. Every Whitesell building (there are 90 of them) has the same shaped sign – 4' wide and 7' tall. They would like to use the same sign.

Item 9 regarding the number of parking spaces. 140 spaces, plus 26 banked spaces are proposed, where 185 spaces are required. Mr. Huettl stated that there are 140 car stalls proposed across the front of this building. He said that Whitesell owns between 10 and 15 similar buildings in Burlington County. Based on these other buildings and the types of users that tenant them, Whitesell knows that the number of stalls proposed is more than adequate. However, in order to get closer to the ordinance requirement, there are 26 future stalls that could be built if necessary. This is still short of the ordinance requirement. He stated that they could achieve the ordinance requirement by converting some of the trailer stalls in the back to automobile stalls if there was a need for additional parking. Mr. Huettl said that they have found in all of their buildings is that although there is a wide variety of users that they could potentially get; in general the type of user who has a lot of employees, either because they have got some type of manufacturing process or a large component of office, they generally don't need many loading dock stalls or trailer storage stalls. On the other hand, a distribution user generally has very few employees but they have a high demand for docking stalls and trailer storage stalls. He said that if in the future they have a user that has a high number of employees they are likely to not have a high demand for trailer storage stalls, so there would be the ability for Whitesell to come back to this Board and request approval to re-stripe some of these stalls in order to accommodate cars.

Engineer Guzzi said that Items 10 – 26 were plan detail items. Mr. Huettl said that Item 10 they would do the stop bars but would prefer to not use thermoplastic. They will comply with Item 11 and 12. Item 13 Mr. Huettl stated that he believed that the grading was correctly done and he would illustrate this to Mr. Guzzi's satisfaction. They will comply with Items 14 through 17. Item 18 the loading dock will be eliminated.

Mr. Huettl stated that for Item 19 regarding reinforced concrete for the loading dock the first 55' of the loading area is proposed to be a concrete slab 6" thick and the balance of the loading area is bituminous pavement. Bituminous pavement gets beat up from the tractor-trailers turning and from the dolly pads crashing down. Whitesell is proposing this to be concrete. Within this 55' strip there is a 10' strip that we are proposing be reinforced with steel wire. This 10' strip down the edge is where the dolly pad (the feet from the trailer) comes down. The rest of the pavement is not reinforced. Engineer Guzzi is recommending that the rest of the concrete be reinforced. In Whitesell's experience it is more cost effective to repair some cracked areas than it is to put in the reinforcement on the whole area. Engineer Guzzi stated that he did not have a problem with this.

Mr. Huettl said that they would comply with items 20 through 26. Mr. Huettl said that on the last page of Engineer Guzzi's letter there is a list of other agencies having jurisdiction

11.

and he stated that there are no approvals required from the NJDEP. Engineer Guzzi stated that this completes his October report. He said that he had done a follow-up report based on the traffic study that was submitted and thinks that that has already been addressed adequately.

Planner Petrongolo stated that he had done an updated letter on January 22, 2010. He said that most of the key items had already been addressed. On page 5 section 3A he asked that a zoning map be added to the plans. Mr. Huettl said that this particular site is zoned General Manufacturing and this is shown on the corner of the plan.

Planner Petrongolo said on page 6, section 3, Item A1 he asked that width of the loading area be added to the plan. Mr. Huettl agreed to add this.

Mr. Huettl said that on page 5 section 3 Item A2 was a request for an existing conditions plan. He stated that the existing conditions are shown on the plan, but there is not a separate plan that is called "existing conditions". Planner Petrongolo stated that this was satisfied.

Planner Petrongolo said on page 6, Item 5 there are dumpsters and bollards shown in loading areas. Mr. Huettl said that there is no conflict between the dumpsters and the loading docks. They do want to have dock doors wherever there is a dumpster or a compactor because they need to get to those dumpsters and compactors to dispose of the trash. If the user doesn't have a compactor they might have an additional loading area. Planner Petrongolo stated that he did not have a problem with that.

Planner Petrongolo stated that he could not tell if a handicapped depressed ramp was shown where the handicapped spaces are located. Mr. Huettl said that a ramp is proposed at each door. There is however a situation where there are 2 handicapped loading zones but a single ramp. A person parking in the stall to the right and getting out in that loading zone to the right would have to cross behind the other stalls and use the curb ramp that is directly in front of the door. If they were to put another ramp they would end up with a sidewalk that goes up and down and creates a tripping hazard. Planner Petrongolo stated that as long as Engineer Guzzi is okay with this then he is okay with it.

Planner Petrongolo said that on page 6, Section C, item 1 suggests that the future sidewalk be shown for the future parking. Mr. Huettl agreed to this. Planner Petrongolo said that Section C, item 2 recommends sidewalk along Daniels Way. Mr. Huettl said that Whitesell has built extensive sidewalks on this site. Sidewalks extend from the train station all the way to the end of the cul-de-sac on the west side of John Galt Way. There is a sidewalk that goes down Daniels Way from John Galt Way to the end of the cul-de-sac and it is on the south side of the road. Planner Petrongolo asked why not have it on the north side as well. Mr. Huettl said that he didn't think that it was necessary to have the sidewalks on both sides of the street, as there is very little pedestrian traffic. Whitesell feels that it is adequate to have the sidewalks on one side of the street and this complies with discussions dating back to their original subdivision approval. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that this was correct and the original intention was to

12.

have sidewalks to allow pedestrian traffic but did not require the both sides of every street have sidewalks.

Planner Petrongolo said that on Page 7 Section D item 1 has to do with the alternating species of street trees. He recommended that they not alternate the trees. Mr. Huettl said that they already have an alternating pattern of street trees on Daniels Way and John Galt Way and they would like to continue this pattern. They also prefer to keep it this way because if there is a blight or a disease that impacts a single species you don't lose all your trees.

Planner Petrongolo referred to Page 7 Section D item 2 regarding the requirement that parking lots be screened and landscaped. The proposal is for a berm with evergreen trees. Planner Petrongolo suggests that additional plantings should be provided along Daniels Way to conform to the ordinance requirements. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that the Board has historically with other Whitesell applications asked that Whitesell continue the landscaping plan that exists throughout the site. Mr. Huettl stated that what was proposed is consistent with the ordinance requirements and with what has been proposed in the past. It is a little bit lighter with the landscaping along Daniels Way due to the fact that in the past they have installed considerably more landscaping than is required by the ordinance. He said that due to economic conditions they have elected to not go as far overboard as they have in the past. Mr. Huettl stated that Whitesell takes a great deal of pride in their buildings.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that the Board expects this site to be consistent with the remainder of the industrial park. Mr. Huettl stated that what is proposed is somewhat less than what has been proposed in the past but it still conforms to the ordinances in Florence. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked what the difference would be? Mr. Huettl said that with previous applications there was more extensive landscaping between the road and the parking lot. In this proposal the number of shrubbery has been cut back. The proposed landscaping for this site includes 150 trees, 450 plantings of perennial grasses and flowers and 100 shrubs. So there are 700 plantings on this site. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked how much deviation is there. Will this property appear stark when compared to other sites in the Haines Center? Mr. Huettl said that there would be a landscaped berm on each side of the driveway in the front. This is consistent with the berms that are throughout the road frontage on previous applications.

Planner Petrongolo asked if previous plans included shrub plantings along the front of the parking lot. Mr. Huettl answered that they have. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked if there were any shrubs along the front of this site. Mr. Huettl answered no but there are 20 trees across the front which more that meets the ordinance requirement. He said that as currently proposed they have 100 shrubs and 450 plantings of perennial grasses and flowers. The majority of those are concentrated at the 2 automobile car entrances and the 2 building entrances. This is where the 550 plantings are concentrated. With past buildings there was additional low plantings along the road but these were all in excess with what the ordinance required.

13.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said that Mr. Huettl testified that the shrubbery would be less, what about the number of trees. Mr. Huettl said that the trees were consistent with prior applications. The perennials and annuals will be consistent.

Mayor Berry asked if this reduction of landscaping would be noticeable. Mr. Huettl stated that it would not. Planner Petrongolo stated that the landscape comments have been satisfied.

Planner Petrongolo stated that they would move onto lighting on Page 9, Section E. He requested that a lighting chart be added to the plan. Mr. Huettl stated that they would provide that information, but they will not be able to achieve the uniformity ratio without using considerably more light. Planner Petrongolo stated that this was fine. He asked that the catalog cuts and manufacturers details be added to the plan.

Planner Petrongolo asked if Whitesell would provide the number of anticipated employees. Mr. Huettl said that they anticipate 1 employee for every 2500 sq. ft. of the industrial space and 1 employee for 250 sq. ft. for the office space. He said that they anticipate that 10% of the building would be office and 90% would be industrial. This information was included on the site plan.

On Page 10, Section H, Planner Petrongolo asked that a site safety note be added to the plans. Mr. Huettl said that he would prefer not to include a comment regarding OSHA regulations on the plan. Planner Petrongolo said that the purpose is so the plans note that it is important to have a designated site safety person on site. Mr. Huettl stated that Whitesell is concerned about safety. They have a designated safety officer. There are safety meetings and safety seminars. Planner Petrongolo stated that since it is on the record that there is a designated safety officer it will not be necessary to add the note to the plan.

Motion of Ryan, seconded by Berry to open the hearing to public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all members present. Seeing no one wishing to offer comment, motion was made by Berry, seconded by Ryan to close the public portion. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that the applicant has asked for Preliminary and Final approval with the following conditions.

Solicitor Frank listed the conditions:

That prior to any subsequent application within the Haines Center, Whitesell will provide an updated traffic study that will include the Cedar Lane and Florence Columbus Road intersections with Route 130 and will address more fully the additional development that is approved and planned.

The gravel fire lane will be relocated.

14.

A waiver is required for curbing in the rear of the property adjacent to the trailer parking and the drives in that area.

A waiver is required for the depth of the parking spaces along Daniels Way, 18' where 20' is required. In addition a waiver is required for parking setback, 75' required and 28' proposed along Daniels Way.

A waiver is required for loading space dimension, 15' required, 13'4" is proposed. These spaces will be 53' long.

A waiver is required for the height of the sign, 6' permitted, 7' proposed.

A waiver is required to number of parking spaces, 185 required, 140 proposed with 26 additional banked spaces. If the banked spaces are constructed sidewalk will be constructed along them as well.

The applicant will conform to the Board Engineer's letter with the exceptions that were noted in the testimony that was given on the record.

The applicant will conform to the Board Planner's review letter as discussed. A waiver will be granted to the requirement that the zoning map be shown on the plan. The landscaping will be consistent with the past practices within the Haines Center development, but there will be fewer shrubs along the road frontages. The applicant will provide a lighting chart showing the foot-candle intensities as well as uniformity. It is understood that the uniformity ratio can't be achieved and a waiver will be granted.

Motion of Berry, seconded by Ryan to grant the application for Preliminary and Final Major Site plan approval.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Berry, Hamilton-Wood, Molimock, Morris, Ostrander, Ryan, Bauer,
NOES: None
ABSENT: Lutz, Wainwright

OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Letter from Mayor Berry dated January 21, 2010 regarding Township Council Resolution No. 2010-47.
- B. Township Council Resolution No. 2010-47 regarding preliminary investigation as to whether a certain area along West Front Street should be designated as an "Area in Need of Redevelopment".

15.

The Board had a brief discussion regarding Township Council Resolution No. 2010-47 for a preliminary investigation into whether the Griffin Pipe property should be designated as an area in need of redevelopment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Council Representative Ryan left the meeting.

Motion of Berry, seconded by Molimock to open the hearing to public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Seeing no one wishing to comment, Motion was made by Ostrander, seconded by Berry to close the public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Motion of Berry, seconded by Molimock to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Paul Ostrander, Secretary

PO/ne