

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323
October 23, 2018

The regular meeting of the Florence Township Planning Board was held on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood 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	Jim Molimock
Wayne Morris	Ray Montgomery
Tom McCue	Council Representative Ted Lovenduski
Mayor Wilkie	

ABSENT: John Pagano, Carl Mattson

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

RESOLUTIONS

- A. **Resolution PB-2018-22:** Finding Proposed Redevelopment Plan for Burlington Coat Factory to the Township of Florence Planning Board for the Board to take certain actions pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-7(e); specifically Block 160.01, Lots 1.01, 1.03 & 1.04.

Solicitor Frank stated this resolution will be tabled to next month's agenda.

MINUTES

- A. Special Meeting of September 13, 2018

It was the Motion of Vice Chair Molimock, seconded by Mr. Morris to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of September 13, 2018 as submitted. Members Montgomery, McCue and Wilkie abstained. Motion unanimously approved by remaining members present.

- B. Regular Meeting of September 25, 2018

It was the Motion of Mayor Wilkie, seconded by Councilman Lovenduski to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 25, 2018 as submitted. Members Montgomery, McCue and Molimock abstained. Motion unanimously approved by remaining members present.

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Act regarding Lennar, Block 165.04, Lot 63.
B. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Act regarding Florence Township's 2018 Park Improvements
C. Engineer Dougherty's Compliance Review No. 1 regarding B&H Foto dated 10/17/18

It was the Motion of Vice Chair Molimock, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to receive and file correspondence A through C. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

APPLICATIONS

- A. **Application PB#2018-05:** Application for Florence Turnpike Crossing-East, c/o IPT Acquisitions, LLC for Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision and Major Site Plan with Bulk Variances for construction of a warehouse on property located on W. Front Street, Florence. Block 156.01, Lot 90. *Application received 6/29/18. Revised plans submitted 9/7/18. Deemed complete 9/25/18. Revised plans submitted 10/16/18.*

Christopher DeGrazia of the law firm Drinker Biddell & Reath introduced himself as representing IPT Acquisitions LLC; also known as Industrial Property Group, Industrial Property Trust or Black Creek Group. The application before the Board this evening is for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a 528,000 sq. ft. warehouse. The applicant has also applied for a Major Subdivision in order to carve out 5 parcels to be conveyed to the municipality. The warehouse itself is a fully conforming application; however, the conveyance of land to the municipality, the subdivision, creates a couple of technical variances. The property itself is the former Griffin Industrial Pipe property and this application is for the eastern portion. It is about 95 acres in size and the subdivision will carve out 5 lots. Those 5 lots will eventually be dedicated to the municipality for recreation use, open space and other municipal purposes; about 22 to 23 acres of the 95 acres. The remaining parcel is about 72 acres and will be the one to house the 528,000 sq. ft. warehouse.

Mr. DeGrazia stated this site has a long history and he will not go through the whole history tonight. At one time, the operations and business on this property stopped. When this happens, there are always environmental and health concerns that come up. Florence Township took a very active approach. In 2010, it took a look at this property and the one across the street and determined that it was an area in need of redevelopment. At the end of 2016, a Redevelopment Plan was adopted and put in place for this area. As part of the redevelopment plan adoption, which specifies the uses and bulk standards, there was a concept plan that was attached as an exhibit. This plan showed a warehouse, its location, its setbacks, its size, etc. IPT has taken that redevelopment plan as a starting point, what was permitted with no variances, and refined it. They looked at ways to improve it, such as a better circulation plan and a more compact footprint. The area of disturbance has been squeezed down as much as possible. Some of these are really substantial changes; for example, in the concept plan, the building shown was 33,000 sq. ft. larger than what is being proposed and the setbacks were half the distance in some areas than what is being proposed. You will see that great lengths have gone into making it more protective of the surrounding communities.

Mr. DeGrazia stated that Industrial Property Trust itself is a leading national developer. It has experience, it has an amazing product and it also has a great reputation. IPT is not a developer that comes in wanting to maximize the site, maximize square footage, maximize profit and then to flip it to somebody; they're looking at this project as a long-term investment. They are looking to come in and be a member of the community.

Mr. DeGrazia stated that IPT didn't just file their application in late June and then stop. There has been feedback from the community and feedback from the professionals' reports that has resulted in changes and improvements to their plans. This has been an evolving plan and has been through many steps. They have taken the residents' and the community's concerns into consideration.

Mr. DeGrazia then asked for all the witnesses for this application to come forward to be sworn in by Solicitor Frank. James (Jim) Murray, Sr. Vice President for IPT/Black Creek Group; Gregory Oman, President & Owner of Menlo Engineering; Karl Pehnke, Vice President of Langan

Engineering and Environmental Services; Norman Dotti, Principal of Russell Acoustics; and Edward Mayer, Studio Director of Ware Malcomb, Project Architect, were all sworn in by Solicitor Frank.

Jim Murray started with thanking the staff and the residents for working with them on this project. They take all the concerns seriously and have tried to address those concerns and modify their plans. Mr. Murray explained that Black Creek Group is their parent company, sort of an umbrella, based out of Denver. They are a national organization and have been in operation over 25 years as a leading industrial developer. Industrial Property Trust is one of the industrial platforms under that parent company. This project is a class project and geared toward the Fortune 500 type companies and is being built for a long-term hold. They are not mercantile builders; they don't build and flip. They are looking to come into this community and be here for the long term. This is very similar to the 340,000 sq. ft. warehouse that they recently built in Hamilton, NJ. They understand some of the residents went to the Hamilton facility to take a look at it to see what their finished product looks like. They are really pleased that they did that. They have built a similar product in Piscataway; 3 buildings totaling 560,000 sq. ft. Their products look like what they say they are going to look like. They are maintained professionally.

Gregory Oman, Project Engineer with Menlo Engineering Associates stated he is a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey and in Pennsylvania. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated he is qualified as an expert witness. Mr. Oman presented Exhibit A-1, which is an aerial view of the site and surroundings with the site plan superimposed. This plan is entitled Overall Exhibit and dated 9/17/18. This is a 95.05-acre parcel identified on the township tax map as Block 156.01, Lot 90. As mentioned, this falls within the redevelopment zone and the 528,000 sq. ft. warehouse, as proposed, is a permitted use. The site is bound by Front Street to the west, also known as County Route 656. Woodlawn Avenue and single-family homes are to the north. Seaman Drive and additional single-family homes are to the east. Along the southwest is the township's water & sewer treatment plant. And directly south of the property is an undeveloped property that falls in the Township of Burlington. The site today is not developed with the exception of a small area along the western part fronting Front Street that was utilized for parking. Most of where the proposed building is shown is currently wooded area. Along the southern property line is a large mound, which is a closed landfill that is currently monitored by the DEP and landowner and is completely fenced in. For this application, there is no disturbance or any changes being made within that fenced in area. That landfill is staying as is. There are utilities located within Front Street, including sewer, electric, telephone and gas. The property drains to the west and east direction with moderate topography. There is no stormwater on site today. There is an existing water main that runs along Third Street and continues through this property from a north to south direction.

Mr. Oman explained that what is being proposed today and shown on Exhibit A-1 is a 528,000 sq. ft. warehouse. It will be 333 ft. wide by 1600 linear feet in depth. All loading activities are being completely held to the southern side of the building. There is no access or loading docks provided along the northern side of the building. They are proposing 93 loading docks 12' wide x 60' depth; they are requesting a minor deviation, or design waiver, from the redevelopment ordinance which stated 15' wide x 40' depth. 12' x 60' is an industry standard that allows a 13' on center dock door location; basically, every warehouse project that their office does meets that industry standard. To the south of the loading docks, they have the main drive aisle for the loading activities and further to the south, they are purposing 121 trailer loading stalls. They have located office space of 15,000 sq. ft. each at the northwest corner and northeast corner of the building. This building will be built to spec and they are not sure at this time if it will be utilized by one or two tenants. There will be car parking on either end as well as a single row of

parking along the northern façade of this building. In total, there will be 412 9' x 18' parking stalls with 25' drive aisles within the parking areas. The main loop road that circulates around the building is being shown at 36' in width, which provides ample movement for tractor trailers and emergency vehicles to get around the building. Circulation is provided on all 4 sides of the building for emergency access.

Mr. Oman continued with explaining that the two means of access to and from the site are off of Front Street. Both driveways are mirrored and designed the same way. He presented Exhibit A-2 which is rendering of the entrance drives. They have heard a lot of concern on having truck traffic leaving the site and possible making a right and travelling through the township instead of making a left, which is the intended way for truck traffic to go. They have come up with a design that basically separates the in and out traffic with a median; but, on the exiting movement, they provided an additional island between the left and right turn lanes and made the right turn lane narrower and virtually made it extremely difficult for a tractor trailer to come out and not be forced to make a left turn. Even though there will be ample signage for them to follow, they wanted to make it physically difficult for a truck driver to attempt to go over the island to make a right turn. They feel that this will help channelize truck traffic out to Front Street forcing them to make a left turn to head out to Route 130.

Mr. Oman stated this all originated with a redevelopment plan that was generated by the township and it was a guideline for us to take that plan, look at it and see how they could make it better. Not only for the developer, but also for the township and the surrounding residents. The original plan allowed for a 561,000 sq. ft. warehouse where they are proposing 528,000, sq. ft. It also allowed a setback of 200' off of Front Street where they are proposing 250'. There is a 130' side yard setback requirement from the building to the existing right-of-way line of Third and Fourth Street directly behind the residences on Woodlawn Avenue and the redevelopment plan shows that setback to be 153', they are proposing 163'. The setback from the eastern building face to the eastern property line which fronts along Seaman Drive, the redevelopment plan shows that at 238' where they are purposing 389'. They are locating compactors at the western and eastern ends of the truck port. Recycling will more than likely be occurring within the building, but they have also provided two dumpster enclosures basically centered in the building that can be utilized for recycling that can be done by a private hauler based on the tenants' needs.

Mr. Oman continued by stating they are also here for a preliminary & final major subdivision in which they would like to take this 95.05-acre parcel and subdivide it into 6 separate lots; 5 of those to be dedicated to the township. Exhibit A-3 was presented and it shows the parcel breakdown as follows:

- Parcel #1: 2.34 acre for ballfield/recreation (triangular size)
- Parcel #2: 9.96 acre for ballfield/recreation (northeast end of site)
- Parcel #3: 7.59 acre for residential buffer area (southeast corner of site)
- Parcel #4: 2.81 acre for the utility authority (southwest corner of site)
- Parcel #5: 0.25 acre for residential parking (directly south of Woodlawn Ave. residences)
- Parcel #6: 72 acre for proposed warehouse

In addition to the 5 parcels that are being broken off of this entire site, there are also 3 out parcels that are being dedicated to the township as well:

- Parcel #7: 0.50 acre located on corner of Bodine & Third, Block 9, Lot 3
- Parcel #8: 0.26 acre located on corner of Fifth & Seaman, Block 156.05, Lot 1
- Parcel #9 0.31 acre located on corner of Fifth & Spruce, Block 70, Lot 3

The total of the 5 lots being carved off the 95.05-acre site and the additional 3 parcels is 24.02 acres and is being dedicated to the Township of Florence. There is a comment in Engineer Dougherty's review letter asking if any of these areas are in need of remediation. The parcels dedicated to the township do not; Parcel #6 for the warehouse does.

Mr. Oman stated in doing the subdivision, they have created 4 variances which are basically affecting Parcels 3 & 5. Parcel 3 has no road frontage and 200' road frontage is required. Parcel 3 is adjacent to township owned property that does have road frontage so the town will have access to Parcel #3. The remaining 3 variances are all being created by Parcel #5. Parcel #5 only has 50' road frontage where 200' is required; the lot width is 25' where 200' is required and the minimum lot area is 10,926 sq. ft where 60,000 sq. ft. is required. Again, because these parcels are being dedicated to the township, these variances are extremely small in nature and really do not impact the development or its application in front of the Board tonight.

In referring back to Exhibit A-1, Mr. Oman stated that the remaining parcel, Parcel #6, is what is being developed. The green area shown is existing wooded area that will remain. The outline of the gray area shows their limit of disturbance of the remaining 72 acres, with the darker gray area being the existing landfill, which will be untouched. One of the biggest challenges they had with this site when they first looked at the design, was how to handle the stormwater management. The criteria in NJ is if you increase the impervious coverage on-site by more than ¼ acre or disturb more than an acre of property, you are considered a major development from a stormwater management standpoint. This application definitely falls within that category. There are 3 criteria that need to be reviewed: the rate of runoff, water quality and ground water recharge. Two of these 3 apply to this site; ground water recharge does not apply to this site because this is a site in need of remediation. With this application, the pavement around the building will actually act as a cap for this area, so when it rains, the water is going to be collected and treated before it goes out the river, in which it is not being done today. The original redevelopment had shown a retention basin and 2 detention basins. They looked at the property and came up with a grading plan and a limited disturbance and found that the detention basin along the northern side of the building made a lot of sense. Since the drainage today runs out to Front Street or towards Seaman Drive, they wanted to eliminate that basin and try to maintain as much of the vegetative area between the residences and the building as much as possible. They were able to divert, using a typical standard underground collection system, to convey all run off from the building and the grass and pavement areas to 2 basins along Front Street. One located at the southwest corner will be a retention basin, or a wet pond, with a fountain in it. Just to the north of that will be a smaller detention basin which will act as additional volume for the retention basin. This retention basin will reduce the rate of runoff for all your storms up to and including the 100-year storm. It will also provide the necessary TSS removal rate of 80%. Actually, as calculated, they are showing that the removal rate will be 89%, which will be much better than the required 80%.

Mr. Oman continued by explaining the following:

Utilities - there are already existing utilities on Front Street which they will use to service this building. They have confirmation from the township that it does have the capacity to service this building.

Fire Hydrants - They have met with the Fire Official and will be providing the hydrant locations where they are required.

Lighting – LED fixtures are being proposed throughout the entire development; 74 fixtures in total with 2 different wattages depending on the where the fixtures will be. The wattages will be

160 watt or 381 watt. All the fixtures are downward facing, dark sky compliant that provide 0-foot candle along all the property lines. The only location and property line where it will not be 0-foot candle is at the southern entrance and the northern entrance. Within the actual truck areas and along the northern side, they meet the township requirements for .5 minimum for safe light levels.

Sidewalks – Sidewalks will be provided along the entire frontage on Front Street which will have ample lighting for workers that may be within walking distance.

Landscaping Plan – They started with their limit of disturbance and looked at what they could maintain in terms of the existing vegetation and supplement plantings within those areas. They will provide street trees along Front Street. They've enhanced the entrances as you come in and are proposing 2 monument signs; one at each entrance, each being 40 sq. ft. Wet tolerant plantings are being proposed for the basin areas. There will also be standard plantings within the truck docking and parking areas.

Sound & Light Levels - Two areas of concern from the residents are sound and light levels in the southeast and northwest corners of the site. The residents have expressed their desire for a sound wall. The applicant is proposing 2 sound walls; one at the southeast corner of the building, approximately 240' long and 12' high. The sound wall is a product called Ply Wall. At the northwest corner of the building will be an 8' high berm with a 12' high sound wall that will be 550' in length. Exhibit A-4 was presented which is a rendering of the sound wall. This is a new change to the plan. On the northside of the sound wall (residential side) is where they will have their heaviest evergreen plantings which will stay full all year. There will be a total of 781 trees, 1172 shrubs and 3,510 ground cover plantings overall for the entire project.

Remediation - Mr. Oman stated that during a couple of the prior meetings with the Board Professionals, there was some concern about activities that were going to happen during construction; one of those being, this is a site that is in need of remediation. The applicant has been working with the DEP to come up a remedial action work plan. Per the Board Professionals' recommendations, for their construction sequence, they will make it clear to the contractor that the guidelines of that remedial action work plan and the on-site LSRP governs over site construction. The remediation of the site is more important than the layout of the parking and how it's constructed. They have also added to the plans that prior to any disturbance, the contractor will provide rodent and pest control within the areas of the residential developments. Also, any wooded area that will be cleared will have a controlled clearing so that any wildlife living in that area can migrate to the wooded areas that will remain.

Outside Agency Approvals - Approvals that are required for this application from outside agencies are Burlington County Planning Board and Burlington County Soil Conservation District. Based on the what the anticipated tenants for this building could be, it does not appear that they will need a Sewer/Water extension permit from the DEP; but, if the tenant does hit that peak, they will then get the required permit. Lastly, there was the question if the site was looked at from the State Historic Preservation Office. The applicant had their environmental engineer review this and while the site does fall within that grid, because the applicant is not requiring any NJDEP landuse approvals, nor using federal funding, it does not apply for this application.

Mr. DeGrazia asked Mr. Oman to clarify how many acres on the 72-acre site will remain forested area and undisturbed. Mr. Oman stated that there will be 10.15 acres of undisturbed wooded area. Mr. DeGrazia asked Mr. Oman if the landscaping along Front Street will be irrigated. Mr. Oman stated it will be irrigated, and that will include all the landscaping between the building and Front Street. Mr. DeGrazia referred to Parcel #5 and asked Mr. Oman to further

explain that parcel. Mr. Oman stated Parcel #5 is for additional residential parking for Woodlawn Avenue residents and will consist of 36 parking stalls; 12 stalls on the western side, 12 stalls on the eastern side and 12 parallel stalls. Solicitor Frank asked if that was to be constructed by the applicant or by the township. Mr. Oman stated it would be done by the applicant.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked Mr. Oman if there was a plan to control dust during construction. Mr. Oman stated that is under the Burlington County Soil Conservation District requirements and they will have water trucks on site during remediation and construction. He stated if there are any complaints to contact the local Soil Conservation District and they will come out immediately to investigate.

Engineer Dougherty stated the applicant has been addressing the various comments of his letter and as Mr. DeGrazia stated, there has been a review process which started in July that the applicant and the professionals have gone through. They met again in August and revised plans were submitted prior to completeness. After completeness, he issued a letter dated 9/28/18. Revised plans were submitted again and he issued another letter dated 10/17/18. The applicant has answered all of his comments and basically, his 10/17/18 letter was asking for testimony on various items, such as the variances for Parcels #3 & #5. That testimony was provided tonight. He had asked for testimony regarding the de minimis waiver on the loading dock industry standard size, which was provided tonight. The applicant also provided testimony regarding trash and recycling locations and regarding the minimal disturbance to wildlife. He also asked for testimony regarding the parcels that are being dedicated to the township and understands they do not require remediation; but, wanted to know if that implies that there is no environmental contamination on those sites? Mr. Oman stated that is correct. Engineer Dougherty stated that the plans, in regards to the stormwater management, are in compliance with the DEP regulations as well as the township ordinance. He concluded by stating he did have a traffic concern but they haven't heard from the Traffic Engineer yet which he's sure will be addressed at that time.

Karl Pehnke of Langan Engineering and Environmental Services came forward. He explained he is a professional engineer, licensed in the State of New Jersey, with an expertise in traffic engineering. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated he is qualified as an expert witness. Mr. Pehnke stated that his role in this project is the preparation of a traffic impact study and the coordination with the site and civil engineer with regards to access design circulation and obtaining permits with the county on the project. A traffic study was prepared dated August 2018 and submitted. That study was prepared in accordance with typical industry standards. A traffic study has several components and is prepared to identify and document the existing roadway and flow conditions and then to project the traffic associated with the proposed development. It is also to ensure that the driveways will operate appropriately and safely. Mr. Pehnke stated he did collect data in April 2018 and he has been able to cross verify with various other local projects. Mr. Pehnke advised the Board that the existing traffic volume conditions are a very reasonable representation to traffic flow demands on the roadway system. To project the traffic forward, they utilize sources documented by the State of New Jersey. In this area, the traffic increases by 1% each year and his study projected that increase. Mr. Pehnke stated that they seek to look at the worst-case scenario when traffic would hit its highest. The highest commuter hours are from 7:15 a.m. – 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. For this particular project, they anticipate 88 trips to and from in the morning peak time, and in the evening, 102 trips in and out. With regard to the traffic impacts, the site frontage of this property is West Front Street which is under the jurisdiction of Burlington county. They have filed an application with the county which they will continue to process. They have designed the frontage with the county standards. They are widening to provide the appropriate shoulders and widening at the driveways. They have not

proposed a left turn lane on West Front Street per to the county standards. They do not believe this is warranted due to not enough traffic. Mr. Pehnke confirmed that the driveways are designed for trucks to make a left when exiting the site; it will be very difficult for them to make a right-hand turn and travel into town. Similar treatments have been done in the past that have been successful. On the inbound traffic, they can't control that other than to instruct the tenants as to informing their drivers to enter town from the south. There is a current NJDOT project on the Route 130 Corridor with improvements to be made to Florence-Columbus Road/Delaware Avenue intersection. Burlington Township and Burlington City are also involved and affected. They expect that part of the county approval will be for them to help fund the Route 130 improvements.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked about his response to Chief Boldizar's letter as to additional truck traffic. Mr. Pehnke stated the county projects are being done to address the issue; but they will take time and money. These improvements are addressing more than just the growth from this application but the growth that is happening all around us. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said she disagrees that this application will not create additional truck traffic. Mr. Pehnke stated they have control over outbound traffic, but not inbound. GPS navigation may have them coming by way of Dulty's Lane. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that the majority of traffic will travel by way of 295 and through town due to no tolls. Mr. Pehnke stated that yes, this project will be adding traffic, but they will be part of the solution.

Engineer Dougherty stated the traffic engineer has addressed his comments and provided the answer to the amount of parking spaces as to shift work and having enough space for the overlap of workers. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked Solicitor Frank if depending on the end user, would they have to come back to the Board if wanting more parking. Solicitor Frank stated that the site is already pushed to the boundaries; but yes, they would have to come back before the Board if wanting additional parking. Engineer Dougherty stated the only other thing he would like it testimony in regards to some sort of contribution for off-tract improvements. Mr. Murray stated they understand that will be asked of them.

Mayor Wilkie wanted clarification that there is not supposed to be truck traffic where the cars are parked on site unless there is an emergency. Mr. Pehnke stated that is corrected; however, the north driveway is designed similar to the south driveway so that if a truck worked its way around in that direction, they would also be directed to make a left to exit. Mayor Wilkie asked about why the right-hand turn lane as well and if that was just for car traffic. Mr. Pehnke stated that is correct and that the right-hand lane will be more narrow. Mr. Murray stated there will be additional signage at the ends of the site to try to keep truck traffic to only the southern side of the building. Councilman Lovenduski stated that the monument signs coming in have to be clearly marked and plainly visible during the day and at night. There is a big problem with trucks missing the monument signs and ending up in neighborhoods. Mr. Murray stated there will be flood lights and they will be clearly marked. Solicitor Frank stated that he heard Mr. Murray state they will work with their tenants to educate them about not making right turns upon exiting. He asked if language to that effect could be built into their documentation (lease) that could be written in as a condition of their resolution? Mr. Murray stated he doesn't see them agreeing to that being a condition of their approval; but, what they have come up with is a design of the driveway to make it physically difficult to make a right upon exiting. They use an institutional lease that is used across the country and he does not wish to open that up today to change it for a speculative tenant that they don't even know about. Once they have an end user, they will work with the tenants as to educating their drivers. Mayor Wilkie stated that it has been made very clear in prior meetings that all truck traffic must go towards Burlington Township. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated they have dealt with signage, barricades, gates,

bollards, etc. and nothing has worked. It is very hard to control. Drivers are on a time limit and they will take the chance to make the wrong turn in order to take the quickest way. She is very concerned that with everything they have done to keep trucks away from town, nothing has worked and believes that educating tenants is not strong enough. Mr. Montgomery asked if not restructuring a lease, how about a rider to it? It can then be made for a specific tenant. Solicitor Frank agreed. Mr. Murray stated they will consider a rider to the lease. Solicitor Frank stated the Board can make that a condition if they choose. Mayor Wilkie stated that one business changed its starting hours to help with the traffic issue.

Edward Mayer from Ware Malcomb stated he is the architect on this project and is a registered architect in the State of New Jersey. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood deemed Mr. Mayer qualified to be an expert witness. Mr. Mayer presented Exhibit A-5, an architectural drawing of the full site. Zoomed in photos of each area were then presented on power point. Exhibit A-6 is of the roof plan and shows how it pitches to both front and back. Exhibit A-7 shows the short ends of the building and office locations. The colors of the panels are dark gray on bottom with the top 2/3 being a lighter gray to blend in with the sky. Exhibit A-8 is the north side of the building that has no dock doors. This side has more punched windows and more patterning. Exhibit A-9 shows the side with the loading dock doors, which is the south side. This side has the same pattern and coloring with the base being dark gray and the upper 2/3 being light gray.

Norman Dotti of Russell Acoustics stated he is the acoustical engineer for this project. He was accepted as an expert in the field of sound. He presented Exhibit A-10 which showed graphs of various sound levels of the overall site. Mr. Dotti stated he did a study of existing sound conditions early on around the proposed area. He set up 3 sound monitors; one on Front Street, one along the homes on Woodlawn Avenue and one near Seaman Drive. The graph shows sounds taking place on a day-to-day basis over a 3-day period. The limit for this facility at residential areas is 50 DBA. On these graphs, each one of the red vertical bars is summary of the sound for an hour. The blue squares are the average sound level. What this site is allowed to produce at the neighbors is 50 DBA. He stated even with admitting the most sound they're allowed to admit, the sounds that are out there right now are routinely well above those sound levels. What does this mean? This means that the nature of this sound when taken into context to what's out there now makes it insignificant compared to what's out there right now. He then studied the proposed use. Exhibit A-11 is a colorized area of sound showing anticipated truck traffic sounds on site. This plot is the maximum sound levels, not an average. To the east and north are under the limit with no barrier and is under the standard. This site is a good design with having all the truck traffic and loading docks to the south side of the site; away from residences. Exhibit A-12 shows the sound levels with the barriers (12' high sound wall on top of 8' berm) and shows the sound level even further under the limit. He said we are looking at approximately 45 DBA and 35 DBA. Member Morris confirmed this is in regards to truck noise and if the backup beep is considered. Mr. Dotti stated yes, that is correct. He stated the building will be a 44' high sound wall in itself and will block sound from the neighbors. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood clarified that even though the sound levels are under the limit, it does not mean you will not hear anything. Mr. Dotti stated that the current noise level is above the limit a great majority of the time. It is possible residents will hear something, but will continue to hear all the current noises too. The state's noise regulation is enforced by the county and upon operations beginning and 5 years from now, they still have to continue to meet that standard. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked if this applies to during construction. Mr. Dotti stated construction noise is exempt. Mayor Wilkie stated that construction will not be done earlier than 7 a.m. on weekdays and 8 a.m. on weekends.

Mr. DeGrezia stated that concludes their direct testimony. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked if any Board members had any questions or concerns and then asked Planner Fegley if she had anything.

Planner Fegley stated her letter of 10/19/18 had some comments that needed to be addressed. She asked Mr. Oman to address her comments #4, 5, 6 & 9 and asked if he had any issues with them. She stated one is to relocate the LSRP note to a more prominent location and the other is about the flood hazard area. Mr. Oman stated they will comply with #4, 5 & 6 and that #9, they don't have the proposed wall signs here but will comply with that, especially once they know who their tenant(s) will be. Planner Fegley asked Mr. Murray to provide testimony on #8, hours and days of operation and shifts. She knows there is no end user yet but asked him for testimony. She also asked for any testimony on Phase 2. Mr. Murray stated he has no testimony to provide on Phase 2 other than they are still interested in pursuing it. As for the hours of operation, they will comply with whatever the township ordinance states and with what other developers have in place. He is assuming hours of operation could be 24/7. Again, that is controlled by who the tenant is. Planner Fegley stated that when the redevelopment plan was prepared that they were mainly focusing on development, not the parcels to be dedicated to the township. Parcels #3 & #5 do need variances; however, if they had been focused on in the redevelopment plan, they would not need those variances and they are minor in nature. Mayor Wilkie stated as just a reminder to the Board, those sites are sites that in most cases have been utilized by the town for over 100 years. The last piece is the extra parking for Woodlawn Avenue. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked about the parking behind Woodlawn and if it would be a road that will be dedicated. Mayor Wilkie stated it will be public property and will be there to help the residents. It will be township property so the township will have to maintain it.

Mr. Oman stated he would like to briefly comment on the Environmental Commission's memo and their concerns/suggestions:

All Truck Traffic Be Limited to South Side of the Building: He stated the truck traffic will only be on the southern side of the building.

Lighting: There is concern about lighting on the top of the building. Mr. Oman stated there will be none and they are not proposing any. The Commission suggested to have all light levels lowered 1 foot along the residential side of the site. Mr. Oman stated the proposed lighting is compliant with the ordinance and to do such would require more lights. There is already a 0-foot candle at the property line.

Building Color: The Commission suggested the building to be dark brown. Mr. Oman stated dark colors fade and they prefer a lighter color to blend in with the sky.

Sound Wall: The Commission also suggested a continuous sound wall. Mr. Oman stated there is not a need for a continuous sound wall because of the current topography and the rise in the land.

Vice Chair Molimock stated the concern with the lowering of the lights was that they would shine into an upper story window on the residences. Mr. Oman stated the light fixtures are all facing downward and dark sky compliant. Will the residents see the light fixture? Yes. Will it shine into their windows? No. Mr. DeGrezia stated that there will also be the 12' sound wall on top of an 8' berm. Mr. Wilkie asked if there was a visual on one of their exhibits. Mr. Murray stated there was and that the Commission's memo may have been written before the drawing of the sound wall was done. Exhibit A-13 is a sight line drawing that now includes the 12' sound wall on the 8' berm. Mr. Oman described the exhibit and stated that the light levels along the north side of the building are 27' tall. One rendering shows the trees at planting and the other

shows (Exhibit 13-A) the trees at maturity. At initial planting, you will see the source of light at planting. In 10-15 years, you may not be able to see anything as the trees grow. No light will be illuminating into a 2nd story window. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked if a tree were to die, will it be replaced with a like sized tree. Mr. Murray stated yes.

Mr. DeGrezia also confirmed with Mr. Oman that all of the Fire Official's comments had been addressed. Mr. Oman stated that yes, they had.

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

James Carnival of 691 Wallace Avenue was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. His main concern is the truck traffic and he referred to the exhibit of the driveways. He asked if the entrance and exit lanes could be arced to the left so trucks could not enter from coming from the north and would like that to be considered if possible. His thought was that once a truck comes through town and cannot enter the facility from that direction and has to drive toward Burlington until they find a place to turn around, they won't come that way again. His other concern is if there will be noise produced from the compactors and how loud it will be. Mr. Dotti stated they do not produce a lot of noise and the amount, if any, depends on how it is installed.

Melanie Mieczkowski of 1000 W. Fourth Street was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. She is also concerned about truck traffic and stated that at her job they have an extended steel beam (headache bar) so trucks can't go where cars can go. Mr. Murray stated there is a concern that the emergency vehicles could not access all points of the site in that case, but is willing to consider that idea.

Timothy Stanton of 1014 W. Fourth Street was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. He asked what is being remediated on Parcel #6. Mr. Murray stated that on Parcel #6, there are some areas where the worst contamination will be hauled off site. There is a small berm in the west end by the landfill which will be hauled off site to another landfill. The areas that are fill contamination will be consolidated and be placed underneath the building and parking lot areas. Mr. Stanton asked if there would be any monitoring during remediation. Mr. Murray stated there will be air and dust control. Mr. Stanton asked who they were to call with complaints. Mr. Murray stated Burlington County Soil Conservation District and that the contractor is responsible to the County and the applicant. Mr. Stanton asked for clarification of the 2 retention ponds. Mr. Oman stated the retention basin is a wet pond which has permanent water and a fountain. The detention basin is not wet at all times and only wet during heavier rains. Mr. Stanton asked the Board if they have the authority to post any "No Through Traffic" signs on Woodlawn Avenue. Mayor Wilkie stated the Planning Board does not have the authority, but the Township Council does and can look at that if it becomes an issue.

Loretta Monteiro of 219 Woodlawn Avenue was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. She thanked the developers for their changes to their plans in regards to their concerns. She asked if the sound wall could be constructed first to help contain construction sound, contamination, dust, etc. Mr. Murray stated it can be placed as early as possible in the phasing. He stated clearing a portion of the site and putting the berm in place has to be done first, but they will put the sound wall up as early as possible. Ms. Monteiro asked Mayor Wilkie if they would be able to get a property tax deduction if they see a decrease in value of their homes. Mayor Wilkie stated that the Tax Assessor is an independent individual and residents can reach out to him with any questions or concerns; however, the township cannot tell him what to do. Mayor Wilkie stated he is very accommodating when he sees loss in value of homes.

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

Mr. Morris stated it was a great suggestion from Mr. Carnival regarding the lanes facing left. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated the headache bar is a good suggestion as well. Mr. Morris asked if they can make the lanes facing left a condition of approval. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked Solicitor Frank with Front Street being a county road, can we do that? Solicitor Frank stated he is not sure but it can be explored. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated the county is not real cooperative and we don't want to give promises we can't do. Solicitor Frank stated the county wants to remove traffic, not accommodate our concerns. Mayor Wilkie stated the county is aware of our traffic concerns and things are being thought of in the way of a bypass, etc. Only the owner can dictate to the tenant how to drive to their facility. The township can only do what we're legally able to do. Mayor Wilkie also stated he would like to ask to have a sound study and traffic study done again after construction to confirm all is still within the regulations. Mr. Murray agreed to have those studies done.

Solicitor Frank thinks that it can be approached here or at council as part of the developer agreement in regards to tenants being indoctrinated into the appropriate protocol for truck traffic. Mr. DeGrezia stated they can provide information to the tenant as a specific notice. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that has been done and has not been successful. Mr. Carnival stated that truck drivers losing time will stop them from coming the wrong way again. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated we should reopen for public. Mayor Wilkie agreed. All members present agreed.

Fire Marshal Brian Richardson apologized for not speaking earlier. He stated that using a headache bar to deter truck traffic is not possible because of the height of their emergency equipment. The height of their aerial is 12' 6" and a standard tractor trailer is 13' high. He is not sure of the height of Relief's aerial; but, it is higher than ours. A headache bar would have to be placed higher than 13' and would not be able to stop a tractor trailer. Full 360 access of the site needs to be available for emergency purposes.

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

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked if there were any more questions from the Board and what their thoughts are. Her biggest concern is the truck traffic and how to control it. She stated that she was very pleased to hear how the applicant is willing to work with the Burlington County with the traffic issue in the area and would like to see that in the approval. She would also like to see the limitations for the tenants and the route of the truck traffic also be required. Mr. Morris, Mr. Montgomery and Vice Chair Molimock agreed.

Solicitor Frank reviewed the conditions that have been raised:

- No truck traffic in the ordinary course on the north side of the building with signage stating such.
- Either through part of this approval or a developer's agreement, it would be required for tenants to instruct drivers to not use town for ingress or egress.
- Applicant's willingness to work with county on off-tract improvements
- To have a post sound study and traffic study done once construction is completed and tenants are utilizing building.
- Complying with Planner Fegley's comments #4, 5 & 6.

-Planted landscaping that is there for buffer and not ornamental are subject to performance and maintenance bonding; but, because they are there for buffer, it is appropriate that it be a condition to be replaced if needed. Mr. Murray stated he is okay with that, but is not willing to make that a longer bond. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that she would like to see it until maturity. Mr. Murray stated that could be 100 years. Solicitor Frank suggested that instead of a longer bond being posted, if the trees within the buffer area die, it is stated in the condition of approval that they be replaced. Mr. Murray stated that he agrees to that condition for the trees adjoining Woodlawn Avenue.

-Applicant agrees to explore with the county about a right-in only to the facility for trucks.

-Usual conditions with escrows, taxes, outside agencies, etc.

Mr. Morris suggested the small island separating the exiting right and left lanes of the site be NJ dividers instead. Mr. Murray stated it is a raised curb and not an island. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that may be a concern for snow removal. Engineer Dougherty stated that is a concern for impervious coverage.

It was the Motion of Vice Chair Molimock, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to approve application PB#2018-05 with all the conditions stated above.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSTENT: Pagano, Mattson

Motion carried

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

PUBLIC COMMENT

It was the Motion of Vice Chair Molimock, seconded by Mr. Morris to open the meeting for public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

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

MASTER PLAN DISCUSSION

No Master Plan discussion took place.

ADJOURNMENT

It was the Motion of Mr. Montgomery, seconded by Mr. Morris to adjourn the meeting at 10:15 p.m. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Wayne Morris, Secretary

/kf