

**HAINESPORT TOWNSHIP JOINT LAND USE BOARD
MINUTES**

Time: 7:30 PM

Wednesday, May 4, 2016

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Mr. Katz.

2. Flag Salute

All participated in the Flag Salute

3. Sunshine Law

Notice of this meeting was published in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act By posting on the municipal bulletin board, publication in The Burlington County Times and Courier-Post Newspapers, and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk

4. Announcement of “No new business after 11:00 PM”

5. Roll Call

Present: Mr. Boettcher, Mr. Dickinson, Mrs. Kelley, Mr. Dodulik,
Mr. Krollfeifer, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Selb, Mr. Clauss, Mrs. Tyndale, Mr. Katz

Absent: Mr. McKay

Also Present: Robert Kingsbury, Esq., Board Attorney
Rick Alaimo, Board Engineer
Mara Wuebker, Board Planner
Paula Tiver, Board Secretary

6. Items for Business

A. Case 16-02: Our Lady Queen of Peace

Block 91 Lot 3

Marne Highway and Lumberton Road

Use Variance for a parish center

Attorney: David Roskos, Esq.

Proper notice was given.

Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Boettcher excused themselves from the use variance.

Mr. Roskos, applicant's attorney, explained that he represents Our Lady Queen of Peace and they are seeking a use variance approval. They are not seeking site plan approval at this time. They have a meeting in the next week with the county to work out site details. The property is located at the corner of Marne Highway and Lumberton Road and is currently used as the church parking lot. The church facilities are too small, antiquated, and a need to serve their existing parishioners. He asked that his witnesses be sworn in.

Mr. Kingsbury swore in the following witnesses: Deacon Leo Zito, Bill Nicholson, engineer, and James Miller.

Mr. Roskos questioned if Deacon Leo was familiar with the project and if he could explain what they cannot do at the facilities with their parishioners now.

Deacon Leo explained currently they have a parish hall in the basement for functions and are limited to only 100 people. There is no access to the parish hall for the elderly or disabled. They cannot come to a parish event. The CCD (religious education classes) are farmed out to the Hainesport Elementary School and to Sacred Heart Parish in Mt. Holly because they cannot accommodate them. It's a problem for all that participate since they cannot come to their own campus. This is for the existing parishioners, they are not looking to bring in new ones.

Mr. Roskos questioned if there were other activities they do.

Deacon Leo explained that they do a feed a family at Thanksgiving in which they use the Street Community Center or the Firehouse because there is not adequate access to the parish hall.

Mr. Roskos stated that if the building is allowed it would bring these events and activities back to the campus. Off-site facilities would not have to be rented.

Deacon Leo agreed.

Mr. Roskos questioned how the property is being used today.

Deacon Leo explained that it has been used as an overflow for parking for around 12 to 15 years.

Mr. Roskos asked if the parking is adequate with the proposed new facility.

Deacon Leo answered yes, there should be no problem with the two facilities.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned the number of children that attend CCD and if they could accommodate them in the present parish hall.

Deacon Leo explained that they could not and that there are over 230 children. The children range from 1st grade to confirmation grade.

Mr. Selb questioned how many parishioners the church currently has and have they grown over the years.

Deacon Leo explained that they are growing but it is more for the existing parishioners. They presently have 1,200 families.

Mr. Roskos questioned how many masses there are on a weekend.

Deacon Leo stated there are 5 masses on the weekend: 4:30pm on Saturday, 7:30am, 9am, 10:30m, and a noon.

Mr. Selb questioned what will happen to the present church. It is a community center and classrooms. Maybe instead at Easter and Christmas they would not have to go the school, they could hold it there.

Mrs. Wuebker questioned if they planned on having wedding receptions there.

Deacon Leo explained they do not plan on that at this time. They might have something after a funeral for a repast.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that there is a mention of a bride room that will be to prepare for the wedding across the street.

Deacon Leo agreed.

Mr. Nicholson, applicant's engineer, presented a copy of the site (exhibit A1) sketch of what was submitted with application. Gave an overview of the plan. The northern wing would be the educational area and lower wing would be the community center. There are 124 parking spaces. Preliminary located a couple driveways in which they tried to line them up with other driveways. The driveways are located on both county roads. A preliminary hearing is set for next week with the Burlington County Planning Board. There is a very heavy wooded area and are located on the edge of the Rancocas Creek. They must go through the process with the State for the wetlands. A field of handicap parking spaces are located in the center with a walkway. A kitchen is located in the south west corner of the community center wing. A roadway is shown to that area for servicing. There will be public water and sewer.

Mr. Roskos questioned since both roads front on county roads we will need to go to the County Planning Board for approval.

Mr. Nicholson stated yes.

Mr. Roskos questioned if the property is large enough to buffer the use from surrounding properties when we come back with the site plan.

Mr. Nicholson stated there is plenty of room, could be a combination of berms and landscaping.

Mr. Roskos submitted a color rendering of the architectural design (exhibit A2). The building footprint is 72' wide by 89' long.

Mr. Nicholson stated that the property is a little under 11 acres. He explained the different colored areas. You are looking at the building from the northeast.

Mr. Roskos questioned if this space has adequate space, parking, ingress, egress, and storm drainage.

Mr. Nicholson stated yes.

Mr. Roskos stated they want to get additional input from the county, township engineer, and if the Board acted favorably they would return with a site plan.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned how tall the center structure will be.

Mr. Roskos stated 42'6" to the top.

Mr. Katz asked for the square footage of the building.

Mr. Nicholson stated 14,000 square feet.

James Miller, planner, gave his credentials and the Board accepted. The structure is going to replace the outdated hall in the lower level of the sanctuary and adding the classroom spaces. These are additions that are usually attached to a church. The parking will add 124 spaces. A typical service held attracts about 200 people. The calculation is 3 persons per parking which would accommodate 374 parishioner. The parking that will be added to the existing would be more than enough. This would enhance the site and parking. There is a provision in the ordinance 104:53M1 which exempts certain structures from the height requirement, steeples associated with churches are exempt, from the 35' height limit. No relief is needed for that.

Mr. Miller continued with the use variance. Churches are classified as an inherited beneficial use. There is the SICA test which are 1) benefits of the use, 2) impacts or detriments, 3) steps that might mitigate any of the detriments, 4) balancing test that the benefits of the use are greater than any potential detriments. A church promotes the general welfare and provides space in an appropriate location. The engineer gave testimony that the area is more than adequate to accommodate the facilities proposed. A church also advances the people constitutional rights. They also provide numerous community events. A benefit is to offer religious education on site. It will provide an adequate parish hall. The old parish hall is not handicap accessible and other limitations. It will also provide capacity for those overflow service at Easter and Christmas, the feed a family program at the Thanksgiving holiday, and provide a meeting space for the different organizations within the congregation. Since they are expanding most of the impacts already exist in the community. Churches are usually busiest on Sunday mornings when other places are not busy. The impacts are limited. The new facilities mitigate the impact by supplying better facilities for the congregation and not rely on outside facilities to support their activities. He believes that the benefits far out way any potential detriments or negative impacts.

Mr. Miller continued with that there is no detriment to the public good or to the zone plan. He believes there is very little negative impact to the R2 district. This is a new facility but an extension to an existing. There is no impacts as you visit the site as it is now. The building will be located within the property that will provide parking for the uses that will occur there. Churches are compatible to residential areas when they have the capacity to accommodate the activities that occur there. He believes the application more than satisfies criteria and merits the Board's approval.

Mr. Roskos referred to the Ragan Design letter dated April 14, 2016. He questioned if there is anything in the letter that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Miller explained that the letter addresses two separate categories. The planner anticipated there would be a site plan application, with is a little premature to go into too much depth. Through his testimony, he addressed the aspects that deal with the use variance relief and the zoning approvals required to go to the step. He believes they can satisfy the recommendations the planner made.

Mr. Roskos questioned if we could address the issues with headlights possible shining into the windows of the residents across the street. They could handle that by either creating buffering.

Mr. Miller stated they could.

Mr. Roskos stated they are will to address those concerns but also needs to get input from the county.

Mrs. Wuebker explained that part of the use variance analysis is to see how it would fit in the neighborhood, will it have a substantial detrimental impact, and the biggest issue she had was the headlights. Will the headlights be shining right into someone's window went exiting the site. She was hoping to find a way to mitigate that issue. Also provide some landscaping buffering.

Mr. Roskos explained they are more than willing to work that out with the board's professionals when they return with the site plan. They also need to get the county's input.

Mr. Katz would like them to consider the neighbors when addressing the outdoor lighting.

Mr. Roskos stated they can come back with a lighting plan that does not have spillage off the site. The church is really not an evening operation, only on those special occasions, such as midnight mass.

Mrs. Kelley suggested they look at the driveway to make sure that it does not shine onto the homes.

Mr. Clauss questioned when the religious education ends in the winter time.

Mr. Roskos stated around 6:15pm it would end.

Mr. Clauss stated that would be an evening even.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that he understands the SICA testimony regarding the positive. The other part has to do with the compatibility of the proposed use within the surrounding neighborhood. He's confused due to different testimony given. One of the primary purposes of this building is to conduct more functions there that you have to send off site. That tells him there will be more people coming there then what is there now. He has concerns with parking on Marne Highway and Lumberton Road where the residents are across the street. Will there be restrictions there or are we getting ahead of ourselves with site plan issues.

Mr. Miller explained there will some intensification of the activity at this location because they are bringing some activities that were offsite to onsite. It will be consistent with the size of the building, scale of the site, and the parking is more than adequate.

Mr. Krollfeifer is looking for clarification. Deacon Leo had stated the other events that would be at this facility would not be on Sunday mornings. This would be spread a little since you would have CCD on Monday and Tuesday nights.

Mr. Roskos stated the activities would be spread through the week. The prime time is during Sunday morning worship. No other activities will occur during mass.

Mr. Katz questioned why the parking is near the street where it could possibly bother the neighbors it could go behind the building.

Mr. Roskos explained they were creating enough space between the parking and the road network to allow them to berm and landscape, to create a tremendous amount of buffering. This would insulate the neighbors from the use. The driveways are needed to access the roads. It is not the parish's plan in the foreseen future, the design is to leave open the possibility of closing the church across the street and building a church building beside the parish center. This layout gives them that opportunity. It may never come. If they were to put the parish center out front, it would stop it from ever working together.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned if the church was the owner of the property between Rancocas Road and the Church. Also if they owned any further property on Lumberton Road.

Mr. Nicholson stated they only own the church property with the rectory next to it and then it is residential to Rancocas Road. Nothing more on Lumberton Road.

Mrs. Tyndale asked how many people the social hall could hold and if the kitchen was off of it.

Deacon Leo believes it is 350 people. The kitchen is located off the hall and is a commercial kitchen.

Mrs. Tyndale questioned if they planned on renting the facility in the future.

Mr. Roskos stated they could stipulate that this would not be used as a banquet hall, it is for the use of the parish.

Deacon Leo stated they are not renting it.

Mr. Selb suggested if possible to widen the driveway on Marne Highway and it be the only driveway. This would eliminate the headlight situation with the residents on Lumberton Road. The lights would actually go onto the Church's property.

Mr. Nichols will explore it with the county. They normally do not like pushing people into an intersection when not needed.

Mr. Roskos said we could also explore having the driveway split property lines. Mr. Engle from the county likes to see them lined up. They will propose it to the county. This is not a big traffic generator, their peak hour is on Sundays.

Mr. Selb commented that there will be 220 children there on Monday and Tuesday for CCD. Someone has to pick them up which be a lot of cars. He does not know what will occur the other four days. He is looking down the road because the township will be the one to hear the complaints.

Deacon Leo commented that 6pm is early evening, it is not when people are sleeping.

Mr. Selb stated that light coming into your house can be disrupting.

Mr. Roskos commented that they are sensitive to the Boards and public's concerns. They are willing to put landscaping in their front yards if they are getting splashing from the lights. They have been here a long time and want to work with the neighbors. Part of the issue is they are on two county roads, in which we have to also work with the county engineer. Two exits allows people to exit the site more quickly and go in different directions without clogging up the intersections.

Mr. Dodulik suggested that they make it an angled right turn only out onto Lumberton Road so that the headlights are not directly shining across the street.

Mr. Roskos stated they will take that to the county.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that there was an issue with the lighting at the dialysis center on Route 38 and was rectified with shrubs.

Mr. Selb commented that the shrubs will solve the problem in another 3 to 5 years after they have grown.

Mr. Roskos suggested they put in some berm with landscaping on top.

Mrs. Wuebker stated that you will have to have sidewalks and that may impede on people getting to the sidewalk.

Mr. Katz opened public comment.

Nancy and Joseph Scullion, 7 Lumberton Road, were sworn in. Her driveway is located directly across the proposed driveway on Lumberton Road. They are requesting the ingress/egress driveway on the plans across from them be moved due to safety issues first. They can only pull in and back out of their driveway. This creates a potential problem for a traffic accident. There is a concern addressed in the Ragan Design letter on page 4 item D. Another concern is that the headlights will be shining directly into their front windows when parishioners are exiting. A concern with lights #2 and #4 on the plan which are directly across from their home that infringe on their right of enjoyment to their home. She questioned why two lights are needed in such a small area. They agree with the Ragan Design comment to increase the width of the landscaping buffers to screen headlights pulling into parking spaces along Marne Highway and Lumberton Road. It would beautify the residential area that is being used as a non-residential use. She questioned if the parking lot was legally done.

Mr. Katz stated we do not have an answer at this time and directed Mrs. Wuebker to look into it.

They suggested that the move the ingress/egress driveway more towards where the parish parking lot is currently, make a right in and right out only with a concrete divider. It will help with the flow of traffic, stop the lights shining directly on their home, and help with preventing an accident. They would like to have only one light across the street from their home that would not impact the neighborhood. They welcome the parish and their parishioners as long as the driveway issue is changed and the mentioned conditions addressed. They had some concerns that have been addressed. She questioned if there would be any buses coming in.

Deacon Leo stated no.

Mrs. Scullion questioned if there will be a maintenance man to clean up the property.

Deacon Leo stated yes.

Mrs. Scullion commented that the property was only mowed a few times. She was told by a parishioner that there was no money left because there were no funds left due to the snow removal. A neighbor tried to mow it and a church official stopped him and it was mowed soon after. She does not want to have to complain to the township or parish regarding outside maintenance. She also had concerns it there will be garbage can placed and will they be changed to prevent a rodent problem, will there be a dumpster on the property. She asked if the residents will receive notices to attend meetings with regard to this project.

Mr. Katz answered yes.

Mrs. Scullion referred to the map on the location she believes would be the best location for the driveway on Lumberton Road.

Mr. Katz thanked her and commented that she brought up some good points, some points that the Board had brought up, especially the angled right turn only.

Robert Stanley, 11 Lumberton Road, was sworn in. He has been in construction for 25 years. The lighting is still going to infringe on their properties at night. The angled driveway will help but will point it at someone else's house. The driveway as it exists now is not a problem but there is no night time use of it now. He believes it will only bring more problems. They already have problems with traffic on Lumberton Road and the police are good with everything else but don't do anything regarding traffic. They have had problems in the past with the church and have had problems with parking before the parking lot was built. He would like other avenues investigated before they proceed such as do they still own any property over at the CYO field or perhaps get the township community center. The church doesn't pay property taxes and he does. He believes his property value will go down. He will get a lawyer and get his assessment lowered. He's sure other people behind him will do the same and the township will lose money. The handicap issue at the church can be easily addressed. He is against it.

Karla McCoy was sworn in. She stated she has lived on the corner of Marne Highway and Lumberton Road for 11 years. She has only been able to pull out of her driveway onto Marne Highway about two dozen times in the past 11 years. She does not like the idea of someone making a left onto Marne Highway, it should be only a right in and a right out. It is a major safety concern.

Mr. Katz agrees that making a left onto Marne Highway and Lumberton Road is dangerous.

Debra Paul, 103 Lumberton Road, was sworn in. She questioned how it will lessen the amount of people that will attend mass if it is a parish center.

Mr. Roskos explained the church will remain and the parish center will only be used for mass on Easter and Christmas for the overflow. They do not want to abandon the existing church.

Mrs. Paul asked if the wetlands would be disturbed.

Mr. Roskos stated they have no plans at this time.

Kathy Banach, 15 Lumberton Road, was sworn in. She questioned when the CCD times are and how many students.

Inez Fama, Religious Ed Coordinator, was sworn in.

Mrs. Fama stated the times are 5pm to 6:15 on Monday and Tuesday. There are about 138 children on Mondays and about 165 on Tuesdays.

Ms. Banach questioned if there would be 100 plus parents dropping their children off.

Mrs. Fama stated the parents do a lot of carpooling. We could have one family picking up five children. The parents are really good about picking up the children. She has rules in place on how to pick up the children.

Ms. Banach commented that she lives on Lumberton Road and the traffic already backs up on that road.

Mr. Stanley stated that the classes are during day light savings time and it would be dark at that time. He questioned if this is approved would it give them approval for the church later.

Mr. Katz commented they would have to come back.

Mr. Stanley asked if they will be able to do anything there.

Mr. Katz commented it would probably come up in a motion if they are approved.

Mr. Katz closed public comment.

Mr. Kingsbury explained that this is for a use variance only, if it is approved it would be subject to site plan approval. It will take 5 yes votes to pass. It would be an approval based on what they represent here tonight, not for a church, but for a community center and educational center.

Mr. Selb questioned if it meets the SICA does that automatically give them a yes.

Mr. Kingsbury explained that the Board is not compelled to grant a use variance. It is in the Board's discretion if it meets those requirements. SICA is a case.

Mrs. Wuebker requested if the Board were to grant it, if they could make it a condition that it is subject to the recommendations in the planners report and they have agreed to a condition not to use it as a banquet hall.

Mr. Clauss motioned to approve the parish center and gave clarification that it is not for a church.

Mr. Selb commented that testimony was given that at the holiday season it would be used as a church and he does not want them to be in violation.

Mr. Roskos explained they will be maintaining the existing church and that is where mass will be held. There a couple times a year, on Easter and Christmas additional people come back to the faith. On those days they currently rent an outside facility, they would like to use the facility for those two occasions.

Mr. Lynch questioned if he was talking about just Christmas or Christmas and Christmas Eve.

Deacon Leo explained it is the day before Easter, Easter day, Christmas Eve, and Christmas day.

Mr. Clauss was concerned with that it was being built as a community center and not a church. He withdrew his motion.

Mrs. Kelley motioned to approve the use variance for a parish center contingent upon site plan approval and the planner's letter.

Second: Mr. Krollfeifer

Roll call: Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes; Mr. Clauss, yes; Mr. Dodulik, yes;
Mr. Lynch, yes; Mr. Selb, yes, but has concerns that it would become kind of church activity; Mr. Katz, yes, it will need some restrictions at time of site plan

Motion carries to approve.

Mr. Roskos thanked the Board and they will meet with the county and will be back with site that hopefully addresses the issues that were heard tonight.

B. Case 16-03: WaWa

Block 101.04 Lot 1

1301 Route 38

Preliminary & Final Site Plan for proposed trash enclosure

Attorney: Duncan Prime, Esq.

Proper notice was given.

Duncan Prime, applicant's attorney, this is a minor site plan application for the WaWa located at 1301 Rout 38. Currently on site, WaWa stores and collects their trash in an older enclosure which houses one dumpster. They wish to demolish the existing structure and build a new one to be surrounded by an 8' PVC fence positioned in the same location. In the new enclosure would be a state of the art trash compactor as well as a card board dumpster for recycling. The enclosure would be more attractive and match part of the building. The compactor is quite and water tight which omits no odors. They are proposing no other items on site.

Mr. Krollfeifer asked for clarification that you would be only demolishing the structure of fencing and nothing else.

Mr. Prime stated that was correct.

Mark Whitaker, engineer, was sworn in. He gave his credentials and the Board accepted. He presented a color rendering of plan (exhibit A1). They are proposing to replace the existing trash enclosure that is located on the west side of the building. A new 6" concrete pad would be constructed with an 8' high solid white PVC fence to house. The gates are self-closing. It will house a dumpster for recyclables, and a 6 cubic yard trash

compactor. There will be an LED light mounted 12' high and will give information requested in the engineers letter. This will provide a much better operation in the dumpster. Trash is currently picked up every day and with the new it would only have to be picked up two to three times a week. It is about a ten minute process. They have agreed to all the comments in the Ragan Design Group letter dated April 26, 2016. In regards to the Alaimo letter dated April 27, 2016, they agree to all except two items. Item #9 requests repairs to the existing 25' wide ingress/egress easement with belongs to the adjacent parcel. WaWa has improved their parking area up to that easement. They will notify the owner of the shopping center that the Board has asked that it be maintained. They are requesting a waiver on the request by Alaimo for the lighting for the entire site. The light poles are old, he doesn't know exactly the height of the poles. He would be giving something that he could not count on being accurate. He will provide it for the proposed lighting in trash enclosure. They have also asked for submission waivers for the traffic study, EIS, description of dust, noise, vibration, showing all buildings within 100 feet, landscaping plan, and soil erosion plan. He believes the improvement are limited to a small portion of the site and they are not needed.

Mrs. Wuebker asked for clarification on the size.

Mr. Whitaker stated it is 14' deep and 18' wide.

Mrs. Wuebker questioned if the 8' fence is necessary and could a 6' fence be used.

Mr. Whitaker stated they used an 8' fence to screen the trash compactor.

Mr. Boettcher commented that it would keep the debris within the enclosure.

Mr. Dodulik questioned how close the new structure comes to the WaWa building. There will still be a walkway.

Mr. Whitaker stated 10'. The walkway will still be there and there is a man door from the building to get to enclosure.

Mr. Dickinson questioned if the three new WaWa's on Route 38 have this same enclosure.

Mr. Prime answered yes.

Mr. Krollfeifer noticed that sketch #4 makes reference near the ADA ramp. Why keep that open for foot traffic in that area.

Mr. Whitaker explained it is to accommodate the employee coming out with trash which could be handicap.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned why not block off the section in the back to discourage the people walking through and that would solve the problem with the grass and bare spots.

Mr. Whitaker stated they don't want to encourage the walk through but they would just find a different way.

Mr. Boettcher pointed out that this was the first stand-alone store with the entrance in the front. There was nothing put in for foot trash when they constructed the buildings behind it.

Mr. Alaimo stated that comment two of his letter references the removal of the concrete pad and asked if they were in agreement to that.

Mr. Prime stated yes.

Mr. Alaimo asked what types of trucks are used to pick up from the enclosure and the turn radius in that area.

Mr. Whitaker explained it is the typical trash truck that has the forks in the front to pick up. There is adequate clearance to access the compactor. They can provide the truck turning radius on the plan.

Mr. Alaimo stated that number 4 of his letter has to be amended. Martin Miller did an informal review of those improvement and still are going to do a final sign off.

Mr. Whitaker stated that the improvements were to bring it up to ADA compliance.

Mr. Alaimo referred to item 5, which is a repair to the inlet area.

Mr. Whitaker agreed to it.

Mr. Alaimo is ok with the waiver for the site lighting as long as the Board is ok. The applicant has agreed to the other issues in the letter.

Mr. Boettcher questioned if the trash is picked up in off hours.

Mr. Prime explained they try to, currently they come once a day.

Mr. Katz opened public comment. None. Closed public.

Mr. Clauss asked if there could better signage about no parking for the trash truck to enter.

Mr. Kingsbury a motion for submission requirements, site plan amendments for a new trash enclosure subject to the compliance of the planner and engineer letters. With the exception of the lighting and #9 on Alaimo letter.

Mr. Krollfeifer motioned to approve as stated.

Second: Mr. Dodulik

Roll call: Mr. Krollfeifer, yes; Mr. Dodulik, yes; Mr. Boettcher, yes; Mr. Dickinson, yes;
Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. Clauss, yes; Mr. Lynch, yes; Mr. Selb, yes;
Mr. Katz, yes

Motion carries to approve.

C. Discussion for zoning ordinance amendment for review and consistency with the Master Plan. An ordinance repealing and replacing article IX, Low and Moderate Income Housing, 104-65, sub-sections D, E, and F, regarding residential and non-residential development fees.

Mrs. Wuebker explained that Township Committee introduce an ordinance for the development fees at their last meeting. They sent it to this Board for comments and a decision if it is consistent with the master plan.

It is a development fee pertaining to affordable housing. The ordinance is to increase the fee that is allowed by law. Our current fee dates back to 1992 and needs to be updated. It is what is required by state for a nonresident development fee which is 2.5% of equalized assessed value and 1.5% for resident development. It also clarifies when and when it doesn't apply. We wanted to make sure that something was in place so that the Township is capturing the amount of funds that we are entitled to so that it can assist the township in meeting its affordable housing obligation.

Tonight she needs a motion tonight to give any comments or feedback and for the recommendation that it is consistent with the master plan.

Mrs. Kelley questioned 2C and E.

Mrs. Wuebker explained that if you demolished an old residential structure and built a new one, you would not be subject to the fee. For nonresidential if you demolish a structure and rebuild you would be subject to the difference of the equalized value.

Mr. Krollfeifer motioned to approve.

Second: Mr. Selb

Roll call: Mr. Krollfeifer, yes; Mr. Selb, yes; Mr. Boettcher, abstain;
Mr. Dickinson, abstain; Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. Clauss, yes;
Mr. Dodulik, yes; Mr. Lynch, yes; Mr. Katz, yes

Motion carries.

7. Minutes

A. Regular Meeting Minutes of March 2, 2016

Motion to approve: Mrs. Kelley

Second: Mr. Clauss

Roll call: Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. Clauss, yes; Mr. Boettcher, yes; Mr. Dickinson, yes;
Mr. Dodulik, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes; Mr. Lynch, abstain; Mr. Selb, yes;
Mr. Katz, yes

Motion carries.

8. Resolutions - None

9. Correspondence

- A. Letter dated February 22, 2016 from PSE&G. Freshwater wetlands statewide general permit #1 application notice to county and municipal officials. Regarding property

within the entire PSE&G service area encompassing 15 NJ counties and their 268 municipalities.

- B. Resolution 2016-71-3 to confirm and correct resolution 2016-21-1 appointing class IV alternate members to the Joint Land Use Board
- C. Certification dated March 16, 2016 from Burlington Co Soil to Mr. Blair.
Re: Block 64.01 Lots 14.01 & 7.01- Longnecker Residences
- D. Letter dated March 22, 2016 from Burlington Co. Planning Board to Mr. Gravlin.
Re: Diamantis – Pep Boys & Retail Center Site Plan Block 100 Lot 8.01
- E. Letter dated March 24, 2016 from Jack Gravlin to Land Use Board
Re: Diamantis/Pep Boys Block 100 Lot 8.01 Case: 15-05A
- F. Letter dated March 31, 2016 from Mr. Bigoss, Fire Official to Diamantis.
Re: Pep Boys and Retail, Block 100 Lot 8.01
- G. Certification dated April 1, 2016 from Burlington Co Soil to Mr. Blair
Re: Hainesport Shopping Center - Block 83.01 Lots 1-3, Block 96 Lot 1,
Block 96.01 Lot 1
- H. Letter dated April 6, 2016 from Alaimo Association to Mr. Selb.
Re: Hainesport Enterprises Block 58.01 Lots 1-6, Block 62.01 Lot 1
Soil Erosion/Restoration, Performance Guarantee
- I. Letter dated April 19, 2016 from Alaimo Association to Mr. Katz
Re: Diamantis Children's Trust, Block 100 Lot 8.01 – Compliance plan review.

Motion to accept and file: Mr. Boettcher

Second: Mr. Krollfeifer, the resolution appointments have the two numbers backwards,
with correction

Roll call: Mr. Boettcher, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes; Mr. Dickinson, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes;
Mr. Clauss, yes; Mr. Dodulik, yes; Mr. Lynch, yes; Mr. Selb, yes;
Mr. Katz, yes

10. Professional Comments - None

11. Board Comments

Mr. Krollfeifer suggested that we send a thank you letter to Mr. Tiver for his service to the Board.

The Board agreed.

12. Public Comments - None

13. Adjournment

Mr. Krollfeifer motioned to adjourn at 9:49pm.
Second: Mr. Selb

Roll call: All in favor

Paula L. Tiver, Board Secretary