

1.

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323
January 23, 2018

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 to the official newspapers and posted in the main hall of the Municipal Complex."

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

Mildred Hamilton-Wood	Thomas McCue
James Molimock	Ray Montgomery
Mayor Craig Wilkie	Council Representative Ted Lovenduski

ABSENT: Wayne Morris

At this time, there are no designated alternates.

ALSO PRESENT: Solicitor David Frank
Engineer Hugh Dougherty
Planner Barbara Fegley

SWEARING IN AND SEATING OF NEW MEMBERS AND/OR ALTERNATES

Solicitor Frank stated Wayne Morris was not here this evening and ordinarily he would be sworn in as the Board's Class II member for a 1-year term. Solicitor Frank then administered the Oath of Office to Mildred Hamilton-Wood as a Class IV member for a 4-year term expiring December 31, 2021.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2018

Solicitor Frank asked for nominations for Board Chairperson. It was the Motion of Mayor Wilkie, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to nominate and reinstate Mildred Hamilton-Wood for Chairperson; James Molimock for Vice-Chairperson; Wayne Morris as Board Secretary, with Karen Federico serving as Acting Board Secretary during Mr. Morris' absence; and Karen Federico as Board Clerk.

Seeing no other nominations, it was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. McCue to close the nominations. Nominations unanimously approved by all those present. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood thanked everyone for the opportunity to once again service as chairperson and chaired the meeting at this time.

APPOINTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF

2.

It was the Motion of Mr. Montgomery, seconded by Mr. Molimock to Appoint David Frank as Board Solicitor; Hugh Dougherty as Board Engineer; and Barbara Fegley as Board Planner. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

RESOLUTIONS

- A. Resolution No. P.B.-2018-01: Appointment of Planning Board Solicitor, Engineer and Planner**
- B. Resolution No. P.B.-2018-02: Establishing the Annual Schedule of Regular Meetings and Other Policies Relating to the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act**
- C. Resolution No. P.B.-2018-03: Readopting the Florence Township Planning Board Administrative Rules**

It was the Motion of Mr. Molimock, seconded by Mr. McCue to approve Resolution No. PB-2018-01, PB-2018-02, and PB-2018-03. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

- D. Resolution PB-2018-04: Finding Proposed Redevelopment Plan for Weiss (Block 160.01, Lots 4, 11.01, 11.02 and 24) Substantially Consistent with the Township's Master Plan and Recommending Adoption of the Plan Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-7(e).**

It was the Motion of Mr. Molimock, seconded by Councilman Lovenduski to approve Resolution No. PB-2018-04.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Molimock, Montgomery, McCue, Hamilton-Wood, Lovenduski, Wilkie
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried

- E. Resolution PB-2018-05: Approving application PB#2017-05 for US Home Corporation (Lennar) for Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision and Site Plan for property located on Florence-Columbus Road and Regars Drive, Florence Township, Block 165.04, Lot 63.**

It was the Motion of Mr. Molimock, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to approve Resolution No. PB-2018-05.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Molimock, Montgomery, McCue, Hamilton-Wood, Lovenduski, Wilkie
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried

3.

F. Resolution PB-2018-06: Approving application PB#2017-08 for Richard Lovenduski for Minor Subdivision for property located at 144 & 132 Delaware Avenue, Florence, Block 96, Lots 9, 10 & 11.

It was the Motion of Mr. Molimock, seconded by Councilman Lovenduski to approve Resolution No. PB-2018-06.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Molimock, Lovenduski, McCue, Montgomery, Hamilton-Wood, Wilkie

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried

MINUTES

It was the Motion of Mr. Molimock, seconded by Mr. McCue to approve the minutes of the regular as submitted meeting of December 21, 2017. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Letter received 1/05/18 from Burlington County Soil Conservation District regarding Block 173.01, Lot 7.02.
- B. Notice received 1/05/18 regarding Weiss application to NJDEP.
- C. Letter received 1/08/18 from Burlington County Planning Board regarding Lennar.
- D. Letter received 1/11/18 from Solicitor Frank to Mayor and Council regarding the Planning Board's Weiss Redevelopment Plan recommendation.

It was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. Molimock to receive and file Correspondence A - D. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

APPLICATIONS

Before hearing the applications, Solicitor Frank swore in Hugh Dougherty, Board Engineer; Barbara Fegley, Board Planner; and Brian Richardson, Fire Marshall as expert witnesses for all applications to be heard during 2018.

A. Application PB#2017-06 for Firenze Properties, LLC (Modern Store Equipment) for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for expansion of building for property located at 20 & 50 Harkins Drive, Florence Township, Block 159, Lots 5.01 & 5.04.

Eric Goldberg, representing the applicant, began by stating the applicant is currently using 20 Harkins Drive as both warehouse and manufacturing of his business. Modern Store Equipment's business is basically building out liquor stores; the racks, displays, etc.

4.

Their business has been very successful and they are looking to expand the business. The use is allowed in this zone; however, several bulk variances and waivers are being requested. Three witnesses were present in regard to this application; David Dunigan, owner of the property and business; Andrew French of French and Parrello Associates, a professional engineer licensed in the State of New Jersey; and Kenneth Gruskin, the architect of the project licensed in the State of New Jersey. Solicitor Frank swore in the three witnesses. Mr. French and Mr. Gruskin were found to be expert witnesses.

David Dunigan, President of the Modern Store Equipment and Owner of Firenze Properties, LLC explained that this year is the business' 60th Anniversary. They sell manufacture store fixtures and sell commercial refrigeration; specializing in liquor stores and convenience stores all over the country. He explained that Modern Store Equipment has been in Florence Township for 7 years and they are looking to expand because they have run out of warehouse space. They have plenty of manufacturing space but because the company has grown rapidly over the last few years, they now need extra warehouse space, which the new expansion will entirely be attributed to. Mr. Dunigan explained he currently has about 50 employees and expects to top out at 60 employees at the facility once the new expansion is complete. He stated the hours of operation are normally a single shift from 6 AM – 2:30 PM. There are times they occasionally run 2nd shift from 2:30 PM – 10 PM on weekdays, and rarely run an extra shift on the weekend. The 2nd shift would be staffed by approximately ½ dozen employees just to run the machines; not staffed like the 1st shift of 40 – 50 employees. Mr. Dunigan explained that they get an average of 4 tractor trailer deliveries a day and that they own 2 short-bed trucks that get loaded up in the morning to make deliveries and return at the end of the day. They do occasionally get other box trucks coming in with deliveries. They may have a salesperson stop by; but no customers that come to their building so visitors are a rarity.

Andrew French stated his company prepared the site plan and the documents that were submitted with the application. Mr. French's first exhibit, marked A-1, was an aerial view named "Project Location Map" which was a photo image from 2015 from a website for state photography. The project is located on Harkins Drive; a cul-de-sac located on the west side of Route 130. The site also has frontage on the north side of the property along Cedar Lane. The site is located in the Highway Commercial (HC) zone with an Special Manufacturing (SM) overlay. The existing building is on Lot 5.01, with the expansion designated for Lot 5.04. There was a 24,000 sq. ft. building on Lot 5.04 which was destroyed by fire. Modern Store Equipment then bought Lot 5.04. The existing building has an existing driveway and existing parking along the property line. There are currently loading spaces along the rear of the existing building and there is an approximate 140-foot area of an open paved area as you drive out onto Cedar Lane. Lot 5.04 currently has trailers for storing the finished product. If the project is approved, the trailers will be removed.

Mr. French then presented exhibit A-2, a "Landscape Plan", which was submitted to the Board as part of the application. He explained that it shows the proposed building expansion with a 26,400 sq. ft. footprint plus the existing building which is 24,000 sq. ft. The majority of the addition will be used for warehouse storage. There will also be 3,000 sq. ft. of office space on the ground floor with an additional 3,000 sq. ft. of office space

5.

on the 2nd floor of the addition which will then total 6,000 sq. ft. of office space. With the additional 3,000 sq. ft. of office space on the 2nd floor of the addition, it will be a 26,400 sq. ft. footprint but will total 29,400 sq. ft. With the 24,000 sq. ft. in the existing building, the business will then be 53,400 sq. ft overall. Mr. French stated that if approved the lots will consolidated by deed.

Mr. French explained the following:

Circulation, driveways, sidewalks – The vehicular ingress and egress and its circulation as staying the same. There is an existing driveway off of Harkins Drive which extends through and around the whole perimeter of the property and exits back off onto the end of the cul-de-sac on Harkins Drive. The current 140-foot open pavement area along Cedar Lane will be redone to create a 30-foot driveway and landscaping added to screen the back of the building and improving the looks of the business from the rear. He stated there are currently no customers that come to the facility with the occasional salesman that would visit the business. Pedestrian access to the site is at the existing main entrance off of Harkins Drive. There is a sidewalk on the opposite side of Harkins Drive for pedestrians to walk up the road and they would then be able to cross the street at their main entrance. Harkins Drive is a cul-de-sac with very low volume of traffic. Mr. French explained that the applicant is not proposing to construct a sidewalk along Harkins Drive due to there already being one on the opposite side of the road as well as rarely any pedestrian traffic along Harkins Drive.

Parking space variance – There is currently parking on the site along the eastern side of the property and along the rear of the property along Cedar Lane. They are proposing to re-stripe that parking and bring the parking along Cedar Lane more into the property and construct a landscape buffer between the parking and Cedar Lane. The current parking space size is 9' x 18'. They are proposing to add parking along the perimeter of the site and as well as a new parking area on the western side of the building addition. There would be 80 parking spaces overall with 4 complying with the code for handicapped parking. Per the ordinance, the requirement would be 96 spaces; however, they are seeking a variance for the parking because even with the building addition, the maximum number of employees would only be 60 and there are no customers coming to their site. They feel they have more than enough parking for the operation.

Landscaping – There will be additional shade trees and ornamental trees along Harkins Drive. There will also be additional foundation shrubs and plantings along the front part of the building and a mixture of shade trees and evergreens along the perimeter of the site. The improvement along Cedar Lane would be that the large paved area will be a 30-foot drive with landscaping of evergreen trees, shade trees and ornamental trees to help screen the back of the existing building. Mr. French stated the applicant is seeking relief in regards to a double row of evergreen trees along the eastern side of the property. Because their existing parking is already up to their property line, there is no way for them to do that. There is one row of evergreen trees on the abutting property.

6.

Signage – There will be the existing sign that is on Harkins Drive that is a free-standing sign with an addition of one building-mounted façade sign that would comply with the requirements of the ordinance.

Dumpsters – There is an existing dumpster used for cardboard in the rear of the building in the loading dock area that they intend to keep. They are proposing an additional dumpster, which is basically a 30-yard container, in an enclosure for the western side of the property opposite of the loading dock area.

Lot coverage variance – The building coverage permitted is 30%. The applicant is proposing 33.39%. The existing building of 24,000 sq. ft. on Lot 5.01 is currently at 33%. When adding the addition on the additional lot, the combined on both lots is 33.39%. The purpose of the 26,400 sq. ft. building addition is for the operational needs of the business. This site is certainly suitable for the building addition, circulation, and loading.

Front yard setback variance – The existing front yard setback is 22 ft. off of Harkins Drive and they are proposing to move it back to 30 ft. off of Harkins Drive; the requirement is 75 ft. The new parking at the end of the cul-de-sac is 32.96 ft. and it would be a hardship to put it at 75ft. The existing is 22 ft. and that will be increased to 30 ft. With the new landscaping improvements and with Harkins Drive not a heavily travelled road, the 30 ft. is certainly sufficient. It will be a 75' rear yard setback along Cedar Lane.

Side yard setback variance – The side-yard setback requirement is 20 ft. The proposed parking along Cedar Lane and the western property line will be at 20 ft. The eastern side of the property where the existing parking is, it is right up to the property line. The applicant is looking to keep that parking as it is now and seeking relief or a variance for that portion of the property.

Parking space size variance – The existing parking spaces are 9 x 18 where the ordinance requires 10 x 20. The applicant is looking to keep the existing parking spaces at 9 x 18. The new parking lot to the west of the building addition, to help set that back further from Harkins Drive, they are proposing the make those parking spaces 9 x 18 as well. The parking spaces on the northern side of the perimeters will be 10 x 20. For this particular use, the parking will be more than suitable. The employees come to work in the morning and park in the same spot every day and then leave in the afternoon.

Driveway relief – Relief is being sought for the existing driveway at the end of the cul-de-sac. It is currently 5 ft. off the property line and the proposed will be moved to 9 ft.; 20 ft. is required.

Fencing – Mayor Wilkie asked if the property was going to be fenced in. Mr. French explained that there will be gates located at the entrance and exit near their property line on Harkins Drive and a 6 ft. high PVC fence that surrounds the property towards the rear of the property where another gate will be located. There will not be a gate off Cedar

7.

Lane. The gates are being strategically placed to discourage the public from turning into their driveway and driving through the site. The gates will not be locked.

Truck parking and loading dock size waiver – Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked about there being no truck parking noted when the business has two box trucks for deliveries. Mr. French stated there are 7 loading dock spaces which will not all be actively used at the same time. The business trucks will be loaded up in the morning and then leave to make deliveries and not come back until the end of the day. Raw material comes in via tractor trailers which account for the average 4 tractor trailer deliveries each day. Even with the applicant's 2 trucks and if all trucks are there at the same time, that would be a total of 6 trucks for the 7 loading dock spaces available. The loading dock space size required is 15 x 40; however, the existing spaces are 12 x 40, so a variance is being sought for a design waiver to allow them to remain 12 x 40.

Mr. French stated that all variances, whether it be a flex variance as it qualifies in the best interest of the site and zoning or a hardship variance for already existing items, are needed for the expansion of a viable business that does not create any detriment to the community and no residences will be affected.

Engineer Dougherty stated the applicant has addressed a fair amount of his review letter but he wanted clarification on how many parking spaces at 9 x 18 are being requested for a design waiver. Mr. French stated there are 19 new proposed parking spaces at 9 x 18. Engineer Dougherty stated he has no objection to that variance.

Engineer Dougherty stated he did meet with the applicant in September 2017 who then submitted plans in October 2017. The application was declared complete at the 11/20/17 meeting. They then submitted a revised set of plans December 2017 to address the comments in his first review letter and based on that November meeting. The variances that are being requested are due to an existing, nonconforming conditions. The proposed expansion is for warehouse space; only an additional 10 employees intended for a total of 60 employees. The number of parking spaces waiver is for 16 spaces; they are proposing 80 spaces when 96 are required. Because there will not be a large increase in employees and they rarely have visitors, he has no objection to this variance. Mr. Dunigan stated that a good portion of his employees commute to work by the Light Rail and they would actually not need that many spaces.

Engineer Dougherty stated that he did note that a sidewalk on Harkins Drive along this site would be required by our ordinance and although residential site-improvement standards don't apply to this situation because it's commercial, the residential site-improvement standards would allow sidewalk on one side. That would be the Board's call to waive the sidewalk on the applicant's side of Harkins Drive. Solicitor Frank stated that the construction of sidewalks would have to be related to the development in some way. It is permissible to require a contribution towards a sidewalk in that area; what is not permissible is to require a sidewalk contribution and use it elsewhere. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked Mayor Wilkie if he was interested in a sidewalk fund for the sidewalk that's leading from the Light Rail. Mayor Wilkie stated that was one thought and he also did not know if the County was going to require any type of sidewalk along

8.

Cedar Lane; but, he did not have an answer to that question. He asked Solicitor Frank if that was handled by the town if the Board were to put that sidewalk requirement as a condition of the application. Solicitor Frank stated he spoke with the administrator regarding this a few weeks ago and the governing body does not appreciate the Planning Board granting waivers in regards to sidewalks especially in the areas around Route 130 so they passed an ordinance that would forbid the Board from granting such variances; however, the governing body cannot forbid the Board from granting variances because that is within their statutory powers of the municipal land use law. But also, this Board is not prohibited from saying to this applicant "The town is building a sidewalk to get people from the Light Rail to their site and we would like you to contribute to that." As far as if the County will require anything, Mr. French stated they have submitted their application to the County and the County has requested a 30-day extension of time which the applicant has granted. A sidewalk on Cedar Lane would get much more use than putting in another sidewalk on Harkins Drive. Mayor Wilkie stated there are also gaps along Route 130. Solicitor Frank stated the Board cannot just impose it on the applicant if they feel like it but if the Board can draw a cause on access to their site, the Board does have some latitude on that part. Mayor Wilkie stated the proposed expansion will be a great improvement to the site so the Board really doesn't want to beat the applicant up over sidewalks; however, it is a concern.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood expressed her concern over trucks entering the site off of the Cedar Lane entrance and if there was any way to stop them from doing so. Mr. Dunigan stated that is currently the entrance/exit they use. There is no gate proposed on Cedar Lane. Solicitor Frank stated that can be part of the resolution so that cannot be changed in the future. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood's concern was the proposed driveway was going to be narrower and it will be difficult for them to enter and exit as they have. Mr. Dunigan stated the trucks are not using that entrance during the Amazon shift change hours or schools opening or closing and are not part of the traffic jam. It was also noted that if trucks did not exit on Cedar Lane and were wanting to head to the turnpike or Route 295, there was nowhere for them to make a U-turn by exiting off Harkins Drive. Engineer Dougherty wanted clarification that the turning template for the tractor trailers will work whether they enter from Cedar Lane or Harkins Drive. Mr. French stated that they will have room either way.

Engineer Dougherty stated the applicant has addressed all of the comments in his review letter.

Planner Fegley stated she did meet with the applicant before their submission of their application. They did submit revised plans in answer to her first review letter dated November 2017. Her second review letter was dated December 2017 and her concerns were mainly with landscaping; however, she also had a concern with ingress and egress and asked the applicant if they felt there would be a need for any directional signage on the site. Mr. French stated they did not feel that was necessary and there are relatively no visitors or customers to the site; it's employees or the truck drivers and all are familiar with the site. Planner Fegley then confirmed that the handicapped parking signage on the plan is a little bit confusing and if they would be revising that. Mr. French stated they will be revising it and he will update that to be consistent. Planner Fegley asked for

9.

clarification on the dumpsters. Mr. French stated that the proposed one in the enclosure is basically a 30-yard container and that the existing dumpster at the back of the building by the loading dock is for cardboard. They felt there was no need for an enclosure around the existing one as it is now easily accessible to employees from the loading dock. The new landscaping along the rear of the building will provide a good screen for it. Planner Fegley also asked if the guarantee in regard to the landscaping would be revised. Mr. French stated that would be revised. Planner Fegley stated the applicant has satisfied her concerns.

Mr. Goldberg mentioned Fire Marshall's letter and his comment on supplying knock boxes for the gates. He confirmed with Mr. French that the gates will be manual gates and will not have any locks and that the purpose of the gates is to deter traffic off of Harkins Drive; employees and delivery traffic use Cedar Lane and not Harkins Drive. Solicitor Frank stated that can be listed as a condition of the approval and if they do end up being locked, they will be made compatible with the Fire Marshall's review letter. The applicant agreed to that. Fire Marshall Richardson stated that was satisfactory.

Kenneth Gruskin, the architect for the applicant addressed the Board. He presented exhibit A-3 which was a footprint plan of the building addition. The addition will be 50' high with a lower roof as they plan to install solar panels on the roof. It is made lower so that the solar panels are not visible from the street. The front area will have a 3,000 sq. ft. office area on the 1st floor with 3,000 sq. ft. office area on the 2nd floor. The addition will connect with the existing building on the 1st and 2nd floor which will provide additional egress out of the 2nd floor. There will be some connections between existing storage and the new addition so that materials can be moved back and forth.

He next presented exhibit A-4 which was the elevation. On the Harkins Drive side, the new addition will be integrated as to match the existing building by matching the height of the office areas. The larger 50' high part is set back 30 ft. from that to get the continuous lower elevation along the street with the larger taller section set behind. All of the new materials will match the existing building from the brick work to the metal siding. A new sign will be placed on the building with 3 gooseneck lights for illumination and will conform with what is allowed.

Mayor Wilkie asked if the whole building will have sprinklers. Mr. Gruskin replied that it would. He was unsure at this time how the sprinkler system will be extended and if it would be more prudent for another hydrant or another siamese (two-head) connection. Fire Marshall Richardson stated their concern is that the siamese connection for the fire department is within 50 ft. of the fire hydrant; the reason being is so the single operator of the truck can hook up to the fire department connection and hook up to the fire hydrant while the fire fighters on the truck can start addressing the problem. Mr. Gruskin stated they are agreeing to what the fire department deems most suitable at the time of the engineering and construction. Solicitor Frank stated that the final location of fire hydrant and/or additional siamese connection can be listed in the resolution as a condition. Fire Marshall Richardson stated the fire department does require a siamese as the fire department connection.

10.

Member Montgomery asked about the Police Chief's concern with safety of the employees using the stairs off the loading dock with it emptying directly into the loading dock lanes. Mr. French stated this is an existing condition and there is ample visibility for personnel to see and hear any tractor trailers. Mr. Gruskin stated the stairs can be reconfigured to not empty directly into the loading dock area. Solicitor Frank stated that will be listed as a condition of the approval.

Seeing no further comments or questions, it was the Motion of Mr. Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to open the meeting for public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Mr. Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. McCue to close public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Solicitor Frank stated the conditions of approval of the Preliminary and Final Site Plan with variance waivers are: removal of storage trailers, lot deed merger and approval of Board Engineer and Solicitor, no gates on Cedar Lane, the gates on Harkins Drive not locked unless Knox box compatible, the fire department connection will be subject to the administrative approval of the Township Fire Code Official, compliance with Engineer Dougherty's letter of 1/9/18, revision of handicapped parking signage, 2-year guarantee for landscaping, reconfiguration of loading dock stairs so they do not discharge directly into the loading area, the usual Planning Board conditions and that it was agreed to waive any sidewalk improvements required of the applicant.

It was the Motion of Mr. Molimock, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to approve the Preliminary and Final Site Plan with the conditions as noted above.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Molimock, Montgomery, McCue, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Hamilton-Wood

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called for a brief recess at 8:55 PM.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called the meeting back into order at 8:58 PM.

B. Application PB#2017-04 for Academy Woods Apartments, c/o Bryan Hunsberger for Amended Final Major Site Plan for property located at 95 Cedar Lane, Florence, NJ 08518, Block 148.01, Lot 3.01.

Erin Szulewski of Parker McCay was representing the applicant, Academy Woods Apartments. She stated the property is located at 95 Cedar Lane and is approximately 7.8-acre tract and is located in the RC – High Density Residential zone and that they were here tonight to seek Amended Final Site Plan approval. The subject property presently contains 5 apartment buildings with a total 120 apartment units. There are an existing 147 parking spaces on site and the applicant is proposing to construct an additional 79

11.

spaces within the courtyard area of the apartment complex in addition to stormwater improvements, landscaping and lighting. Two variances are being requested, as well. Ms. Szulewski stated she has two individuals with her who will be providing witness testimony tonight. Solicitor Frank swore in Brian Hunsberger, owner of the facility and Mark Malinowski, Professional Engineer. Solicitor Frank stated Mr. Malinowski has testified before this Board and our Zoning Board is qualified as an expert witness.

Engineer Dougherty stated this application was submitted in September 2017, adjourned to the October 2017 meeting, adjourned to the November 2017 meeting and again adjourned to this meeting. He stated this application has never been deemed complete. The Variance Checklist was submitted complete. He did have a comment regarding the Major Site Plan and that because the applicant is constructing a parking lot, there are some issues that have to be addressed. This is an amended final site plan so the environmental statement would have been submitted with the original application, so he has no objection to that waiver request. Also, since the site is already developed, there is no need for jurisdictional boundaries. The applicant did submit new drainage calculations with this application for the proposed basin. There are no proposed utilities so he had no objection to that waiver request. The only thing he requires is testimony on the use and the need for the additional parking. With those waivers and the deferral of the testimony, he would say the application is complete. Planner Fegley did not have any issues as to declaring the application complete.

It was the Motion of Mr. Molimock, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to declare the application complete. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Brian Hunsberger addressed the Board in regards to the application for additional parking. There are 120 apartments and currently 147 parking spaces. In the daytime, there is plenty of parking; however, in the evenings and weekends, there is a shortage of parking spaces. He stated it seems to be getting progressively worse as more people are working and needing vehicles to do so. Fifteen years ago, he had been approved for an additional 30 spaces; however, the County at that time wanted him to give up 8 spaces for the 30 new ones which didn't make any sense to him at all so he did not follow through with that approval.

Mark Malinowski addressed the Board and presented his first exhibit, A-1, which was a colored aerial of the site. He explained that it is a 7 ½ acre site with 5 apartment building consisting of 120 units; 80 1-bedroom and 40 2-bedroom. Existing parking in along the northern and eastern portion of the site and some additional parking at the southwest corner of the site. The total number of current parking spaces is 147; 6 of which are ADA accessible. There is an existing courtyard, which a portion of will be used for the proposed parking.

Mr. Malinowski presented his 2nd exhibit, A-2, a colored rendering based on the site plan showing where the proposed parking would be. Within that area, there is an existing maintenance garage that has access from the existing parking area and will remain. There is also an existing playground area that will be removed to accommodate the proposed parking expansion. The applicant is proposing an expansion with 79 additional spaces, 2

of which will be ADA compliant. The site will then have a total of 226 parking spaces. The parking count for residential development is governed by the state's RSIS standards. For this facility, 224 spaces are required under those standards and 226 are being proposed. The proposed measurements for the new spaces is 9' x 18', which is not in compliance with the township ordinance; however, it is in compliance with the state's RSIS standards. The existing spaces are 18 ft. deep and vary in width, between 9'4" and 9'6". The aisle width of the proposed parking lot is 24 ft. wide; again, that is in accordance with RSIS standards. The existing aisle widths along the perimeter of the site are only 22 ft. wide. In addition to the expanded parking, the impervious coverage allowed on the site is 40%; however, existing is 47% and with the proposed improvements, it will be 55%. So, a variance for lot coverage is being requested.

Mr. Malinowski stated that to facilitate the increase in impervious coverage and to mitigate that increase, they are proposing an infiltration detention basin in the center of the proposed parking facility. This will capture all the contributing area, not only will it capture the pavement itself, it will also capture some of the outlying areas that currently contribute to that area. This will be collected and controlled by the state's stormwater management standards for both water quality and water quantity. It will be controlled on-site and will be piped out to the county road and into the county drainage system. The basin will be 3 ½ ft. to 4 ft. deep. It is designed for the maximum design storm of a 100-year storm. The depth of the water would just be under 3 ft. if it was a 100-year storm. There is a spillway and a swale line that goes between the northern and western buildings that continues out to Cedar Lane. Any additional relief required from the basin would follow that swale line. It is an infiltration basin and will have a sand bottom associated with it and the underlying soils are very good permeability wise and will infiltrate around 4" per hour. The basin is estimated to drain in about 8 hours. The standing water will be very limited in the basin. In addition to the basin, there will be new lighting in the proposed parking area and there will be onsite LED lighting.

Mayor Wilkie asked if a fence is proposed for around the retention basin. Mr. Malinowski stated they are not proposing one. It will be all grass with the bottom of the basin being sand.

Member Montgomery asked if the playground was going to be relocated. Mr. Hunsberger stated that at the advice of his property manager, they will not be relocating the playground. The current playground is a tot lot and the children that it is intended for do not use it. They do have a problem with larger children, teenagers, hanging out in the tot lot, which is not what it is intended for. There is room on site between Buildings B & C to relocate it if the need arises; but, he would like to see how it goes. Mayor Wilkie asked how many children are currently living on site. Mr. Hunsberger stated the last count that was done 6 months ago was 22 school age children; elementary through high school. Mayor Wilkie asked what is the average length of stay of a tenant. Mr. Hunsberger stated the turnover is an average of 3 apartments per month with the average stay of 3 years. He has had one tenant there for over 40 years. The complex was built in 1969. Solicitor Frank stated that his thought in regards to the tot lot and that it can be relocated if the need arises is to document it on the plans in an outline as a phantom tot

13.

lot so there would be no need to come back before the Board. It would of course be subject to administrative review of the Board Planner and Engineer if it did get relocated.

Ms. Szulewski stated that was the end of their testimony. She stated there are a number on points on the review letters and they are willing to work with the Board Professionals on all concerns.

Engineer Dougherty stated that the applicant did testify as to the lot coverage, so that would be a variance. He stated the residential site improvements standards is applicable here and trumps our ordinance so there is no need for a variance for the parking aisle. The same goes with the parking space size; no variance needed. The applicant did address the need for ADA accessible spaces; with one being van accessible. Engineer Dougherty stated his other comments dealt with the stormwater management and the basin, as the applicant testified to, is adequate to address the RSIS standards. If the site is over 1-acre of coverage and $\frac{1}{4}$ of the site is impervious, there is a need for stormwater management system, which the applicant has addressed. They have addressed what would happen in case of overflow in two directions; one is a piped overflow out to the county system and the other one in the event of an emergency, is the swale built between two buildings that it would flow out through to Cedar Lane. The other items in his letter, items 1 – 18, are minor comments; engineering comments. Mr. Malinowski stated they will work with Engineer Dougherty and address all the comments. Engineer Dougherty also wanted clarification that there is consistency with the current lighting which Mr. Malinowski stated there is and that it is very good and more than adequate. Globally the applicant agrees to comply with all of Engineer Dougherty's review comments.

Planner Fegley stated in regards to her review comments, the impervious coverage can be supported due to the need for additional parking and the parking spaces are regulated by RSIS standards. On page 3 of her review letter, #4; there is an area with a 5' sidewalk which should be 6' for overhang. Mr. Malinowski stated he will take care of that. Planner Fegley stated she will be meeting onsite with Mr. Hunsberger to work out the landscaping, and Mr. Hunsberger agreed. Planner Fegley wanted clarification that there will be no standing water in the retention basin as there will not be a fence along the perimeter. After some discussion, it was agreed by all that if the basin does not drain within 48 hours maximum, even though the standard is 72 hours, fencing would need to be looked into.

Fire Marshall Richardson stated he had no issue with the initial plan that was submitted; however, he stated that with the revised plan, there is not enough turn around for a fire truck in the proposed lot and asks that in accordance with the IFC, International Fire Code, that a turn-around be put on the northwesterly portion of the proposed parking lot so that if they commit a fire truck to the property, they can get it out. The proposed parking does provide the fire department much more access to the property than they've ever had, but it gives them a very severe dead end. Mr. Malinowski agreed to work with Fire Marshall Richardson to comply with his request whether it be with a K-turn or by removing 2 parking spots, as they are 2 spots over the required number by RSIS standards. Engineer Dougherty stated the Board could grant them relief if more spaces are needed to be taken. The discussion of a possible paper street where the swale will be

14.

took place; however, Mr. Hunsberger stated that the distance between the buildings where the swale area will be is very narrow and he didn't foresee that as a possibility.

Seeing there were no other comments or questions from the Board, it was the Motion of Mr. Montgomery, seconded by Mr. Molimock to open the meeting for public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Jeffrey Avrin, 250 Morris Lane, expressed his concern about taking open space and making it into a parking lot. He did question the need for additional parking as he sees open spaces in the parking area in the back of the complex. He also expressed concern of the basin overflowing and flooding even though the water is supposed to flow into the county system or onto Cedar Lane by Ninth Street. His third concern was that children would be playing in the basin and the possible danger associated with that.

Seeing no one else wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Molimock, seconded by McCue to close public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Solicitor Frank stated the conditions of approval are: showing a phantom tot lot on revised plans, compliance with the Board Engineer's and Planner's review letters, the applicant working with the Planner on the landscaping, the sidewalk shown at 5' will be shown at 6', that any standing water longer than 48 hours would trigger the requirement of the applicant to install a fence around the basin, to work with the Fire Marshall for IFC compliance for a fire truck turn-around subject to administrative approval including approval if extra spaces need to be taken, and the usual Planning Board conditions.

It was the Motion of Mr. Molimock, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to approve the application with the conditions as listed above.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Molimock, Montgomery, McCue, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Hamilton-Wood

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried

C. Application PB#2017-07 for James Heupel, 1101 Potts Mill Road for Minor Subdivision of adjoining lots and Bulk variance for non-conforming road frontage lot width on property located at 1101 Potts Mill Road, Florence Township, Block 166, Lots 17.02 & 18.02

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood informed the Board and Solicitor Frank that she needed to recuse herself from hearing this application and left the meeting. Vice Chair Molimock then chaired the meeting.

This application was unable to be heard at this time due to a transposition of the street address on the application which resulted in it being incorrect in the public notice. The address was reported and noticed as 1101 Potts Mill Road, when in fact the address is 1011 Potts Mill Road. After reviewing the MLUL, Solicitor Frank stated he only found

15.

cases that had been noticed with the incorrect Block and/or Lot and not the incorrect street address; however, he advised the applicant that it would be in their best interest to adjourn the application to the February meeting.

Erin Szulewski, the applicant's attorney, will submit a letter to the Land Use office stating there was a transposition in the street address and will renote with the correct address to be heard at the February 27, 2018 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to discuss.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

It was the Motion of Mr. Montgomery, seconded by Mr. McCue to open the meeting for public comments. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. McCue to close public comments. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

MASTER PLAN REVIEW/DISCUSSION

No discussion took place.

ADJOURNMENT

It was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 p.m. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Karen Federico, Acting Secretary

KF/kf