

HAINESPORT TOWNSHIP JOINT LAND USE BOARD MINUTES

Time: 7:00 PM

July 1, 2021

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Mr. Krollfeifer.

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: Mayor Gilmore, Mr. MacLachlan, Mrs. Kelley, Mr. McKay, Mr. Tricocci, Mrs. Baggio, Ms. Kosko, Mr. Krollfeifer, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Murphy

Absent: Mrs. Tyndale, Mr. Sylk, Mrs. Cuniglio

Also Present: Robert Kingsbury, Esq., Board Attorney
Scott Taylor, Planner
Martin Miller, Engineer
Kathy Newcomb, Zoning Officer
Paula Tiver, Board Secretary

6. Items for Business

A. Case 19-09B: R & M Development
Block 100 Lots 8.03 & 8.02
60 Bancroft Lane
Major Final Subdivision
Attorney: Igor Sturm

Mr. Sturm attorney, this is for final approval for major final subdivision. Mr. Gravlin will present and Chis Koutouzakis, environmental expert, give testimony regarding his environmental study.

Mr. Gravlin was sworn in. He gave his credentials. They are requesting a major final subdivision approval. It consists of Block 100 Lot 8.03 and a portion of Lot 8.02. There are 41 residential lots, 1 homeowner's association lot, stormwater basin and two township parcels (related to the access to the proposed park). He gave a summary of the last hearing held on June 22, 2020. Traffic issues were discussed and resolved. At that time they gave the old environmental study and the current NJDEP mapping that indicates no threatened or endangered species, or areas of special concern within the subject lot. Additional information will be given tonight from Chris Koutouzakis on his study. There was concern of potential basement flooding from their basin to the adjoining lot. A ground water mounding report was submitted and indicated that there was no impact to the basements.

The park access road and the pedestrian access lot were discussed and an agreement was reached. Which is indicated on the revised plans. Detail information on the volume of the stormwater basin and the associated run off was provided. The Board asked him to revisit it to see if it was possible to store additional volumes. They are now storing the 100 year storm event. The Board did grant preliminary subdivision approval. The plans were revised based on the preliminary approval and the reviews from the Boards consultants.

He pointed out the key revisions to the plans. Described the access road and a 15' wide pedestrian access from the development to the park. The planner asked them to make it a separate lot dedicated to the township, they have no problem doing so. They also agreed to the road to it and shows on the revised plans. They agree to provide sidewalks on both sides of the street for full pedestrian sidewalk to Bancroft Lane. Pedestrian crosswalks at the intersection of the park access and at the loop street. The development sign has been indicated at the entrance. Many items of technical nature requested by the Board's professionals are indicated on the revised plan.

The drainage plan exhibits are the same as submitted. Additional grades and contours have been added to this plan to make sure the 2% slopes all throughout the site so there will be no drainage issues. When you have a senior development with small lots, drainage is critical. It is all indicated on the revised plan. He was asked to look at storing additional runoff within. He was able to size the basin for the entire storage of the 100 year storm event. If there is a 9" rainfall, not one drop of water will leave the site. It will be contained in the basin and infiltrated. The utility plan was revised as a result of widening the 15' pedestrian lot. He had to shift all the lot lines so there was no conflicts.

The landscape plan required a lot of time. The land surveyor went out and located every single tree on the site. It was approximately 1120 trees. He indicated in green the tree protection areas. Fencing will be installed along the perimeter of the tree protection area before any construction is done. It is not necessary to disturb this area. They are also able to protect the trees at the corner of the open space lot. The darker trees are the proposed infill trees which will be placed pursuant to field visits by the Board's planner. They are proposing 93 additional trees as infill. Within the tree protection areas, they are preserving approximately 226 trees. An additional 79 street trees will be placed all throughout the roadway frontages, all over the 50' maximum spacing. Additional plantings, foundation plantings in conjunction with the home construction will also be placed. They are agreeing to install 2 more trees per house being an additional 82 trees. The ordinance requires a one to one replacement. It is physically an impossibility, it

cannot be accomplished. They are going to request a waiver from the Board from section 104-114 to allow the replacement of trees at less than a one to one ratio. The number of trees is to be calculated as follows: 1120 existing trees all throughout the site, less the 226 trees in the protection areas, less 93 proposed infill trees, less 82 trees per lot, which equals 719 trees. They are requesting a waiver on that and allow the trees to be at a size less than the 3" caliber. Erosion and both detail sheets were also revised as per the review comments.

The planner's letter dated 3/31/2021 includes about a dozen minor revisions they will comply. He asked him to indicate the tree calculation which he just did.

The engineer's letter dated 4/2/2021 contains about a dozen minor revisions and they will comply except for one comment number 11 in the letter. It indicates that he has to contact the county to make sure the names of the streets comply. He called the 911 operations center, county planning board, and county engineer's office. No one knows anything about it. If he directs him to the correct root, he will do that. He searched and believes there is no overlap on the street names. He believes that the plan conforms to the township and the RSIS requirements. This is a project that is an asset to the community and asked the board to consider granting the final subdivision approval.

Mr. Gravlin stated there is an existing easement at the back of the property. He gave the history on it. He met with Mr. Diamantis and Steve Showing, Quaker, and David Brandt in the late 1990's before Creekview was built or beginning construction. Part of the agreement with Showing, Quaker, was that he provide them with an easement between those two future lots. It is a 30' wide easement. He had reviewed the existing topography of the site before the meeting and seen that ultimately in the long run (25 years later). When this parcel was developed, we would need to have an easement for their utilities to get out to Wharton and the existing storm and sanitary sewer. The sanitary sewer pipe was actually installed in it. It is ready to connect and has a manhole at the edge of their property. It is indicated on the final plan of lots recorded at the county. It is a permanent easement that will not go away unless they consent to it. It is not a temporary easement and is there for their use.

Mr. McKay questioned if they would have to dig it up to put the stormwater pipes in.

Mr. Gravlin explained that they would be digging it up to install the stormwater pipes. He has everything that is out there is detailed on his plan and whatever is disturbed will be restored to how it is originally.

Mr. McKay questioned if it would require cutting the street and curb on Wharton Place.

Mr. Gravlin answered yes and will be patched to the township's specifications. They will also need to connect the water and sewer at Bancroft. It was a little upsetting seeing the road being paved right before they are about to do this. They will have to dig it up and agree to repair it as good as it currently is. They will go curb to curb and repave that entire section of roadway. There will be two seams which they can heat treat them if required by the engineer.

Mr. Krollfeifer commented that there was a question regarding the name of the street.

Mr. Miller said that he believes that they did what they needed to and doesn't have a problem with it.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned if Mr. Taylor was comfortable with the plantings and landscaping.

Mr. Taylor stated they have and went over it for clarification. He believes some of the numbers may have been mixed up. Our ordinance 101-114 requires the reforestation as Mr. Gravlin discussed. For every tree 8" or greater in size that has to be removed, one replacement tree at 3" needs to be. The calculation would be for the number of trees to be removed.

Mr. Gravlin stated it would be 794 being removed.

Mr. Taylor stated they are proposing 175 replacement trees. That is 93 infill plus 82 foundation trees

Mr. Gravlin answered yes.

Mr. Taylor state that would be the relief 795 trees were required by 114. They plan to plant 85 and on the plan it was 2½ caliper trees verses 3" caliper. He has no concern with the size. There was discussion during the preliminary hearing about planting additional tree plantings around the perimeter of the basin where some of that traditional grading needs to happen so that may be something the board wants. One of the other things that has been done in other projects, is along some of those perimeters put some additional trees in such as seedlings and tublings that cost anywhere from 50 cents to a dollar. So that we can get some of the edges reforested. Other than that will you comply and provide testimony based on the comments in his report.

Mr. Gravlin answered yes.

Mr. McKay questioned if the seedlings and tublings be a condition of approval.

Mr. Taylor stated that it can, at the boards discretion. He noted that a development site identification sign is shown on the adjacent commercial remainder property. There wasn't a detail on the plan. If it is going on the adjacent property an easement is needed for the benefit of the HOA, so they can maintain and landscape it.

Mr. Gravlin state that it is on the adjacent lot owned by Mr. Diamantis. Mr. Diamantis indicated he will grant the easement.

Mr. Taylor questioned if the sign with comply with the size and standards of the township ordinance standards.

Mr. Gravlin explained the sign will be 4 x 8 and will make sure that it does comply. The exact sign has not been chose yet. It is a low monument type sign only intended for development identification. There will be lighting that shines up on the sign from the ground. It will only illuminate the fascia of the sign. It will be a led light.

Mr. Taylor questioned if they will provide details of the light on the plan. They need to make sure that it is more of a spotlight with a shield around it. They also like to move them towards the front of the sign so that it points back.

Mr. Gravlin answered yes.

Mr. Krollfeifer asked if they agree to the sign, location, and lighting subject to Mr. Taylor's approval.

Mr. Gravlin agreed. There is a need for him to submit final conformance before signature and sign off.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated the last thing would be the easement.

Mr. Kingsbury stated that he supplied a memo regarding the easement in the Board's packet. There was a reference about a year ago that the easement had expired. He looked into it and that was a different easement that didn't have anything to do with the sewer. In his opinion, Mr. Gravlin is correct that the sewer easement has not expired.

Mr. McKay congratulated Mr. Gravlin in having a 25 year foresight.

Mr. Gravlin explained that it was a part of an exchange of lands so that Bancroft would be able to get out. He took a look at it and seen that they would need it. Otherwise he doesn't know how you could develop this project without that easement.

Mr. McKay questioned if they were proposing any fencing around the basin given the slopes.

Mr. Gravlin explained they are proposing a fence all the way around the perimeter of it. He proposed a pressure treated fence and Mr. Taylor asked in addition that it be a 3 board fence of substantial construction. He has agreed to conform to that and will be indicated on the final plans. It will also have a gate.

Mr. McKay questioned if there will be a wire mesh backing to the fence.

Mr. Gravlin believes they do not need to because there would only be small spaces. It is a 36" high fence that has 3 boards stacked. It will almost be a solid fence.

Mr. McKay commented that it is a pretty deep basin.

Mr. Gravlin stated it is a deep basin but will be a dry basin. He has a history with Pep Boys and the restaurant that the water goes into ground. It is a tinted sand there. That is why there was mining out there for all those years for sand. It is the purest sand you can buy and has an incredible infiltration rate.

Mr. McKay question when putting in the street trees, will you be avoiding evasive trees that break up sidewalks and trees like at Hainesport Chase hybrids that die after 20 years.

Mr. Taylor explained that they try and maximize native plants whenever possible and try and use other naturalized species. Tap root whenever possible to minimize or limit the risk of curb and sidewalk heaving. One advantage to the well drain sands, the roots tend

to grow down to find water. If these trees live long enough there may be some impacts to sidewalks. Also the roads will have to be repaved at some point in the future. They try to do the best that they can and decades down the road some maintenance does have to occur.

Mr. McKay asked for a short description of the type of senior housing that would be built.

Chris Aivazoglou was sworn in. He explained there would be 3 types of homes, rancher, cape cod with a loft, and a two floor house. They will range from 1,450 to 1,900 square feet. It will depend if you have a finished upstairs and/or basement. They will have a two car garage.

Mr. Gravlin showed some pictures and stated they submitted them back in 2019.

Mr. Sturm explained that prior to one of the scheduled meetings a neighbor submitted to the Board and Mrs. Tiver, basically information to the effect that there may be endangered species on the property. He believes Mr. Gravlin previously submitted information and testified that the prior environmental study that was performed in 2003. He had also researched the maps and the information available. They decided to engage an environmental expert, Chris Koutouzakis, to make a study and sort of respond to what had been submitted by one of the neighbors. He is an expert in environmental management.

Chris Koutouzakis was sworn in and gave his credentials.

The Board accepted.

Mrs. Kelley questioned when he wrote this report and why was it so late.

Mr. Koutouzakis stated he finished it up on June 29th. He was retained by his client a week or two before that date.

Mrs. Kelley commented that it was referenced in Mr. Taylor's March letter that they were supposed to get the old environmental impact statement.

Mr. Taylor stated the prior environmental impact statement from the prior approval was distributed by Mrs. Tiver.

Mrs. Kelley questioned when it was distributed.

Mrs. Tiver stated it was distributed with the last application.

Mr. Taylor agreed and stated that this separate report Mr. Koutouzakis is referencing a package of information submitted by a resident that was forwarded by his office to the applicant in advance of their prior scheduled hearing and noted they should be prepared to address this to the Board. It was raised as a little bit of an issue at the preliminary approval. The Board deferred that to the time of final approval to address the environmental issues. They then took it upon themselves to hire an expert to address

those issues and then this second report of June 29 was submitted in addition to the prior eis.

Mrs. Kelley explained that she is the chair of the Hainesport Environmental Commission. They are volunteers. June 29th is late and she hasn't had time to really assess it. She doesn't feel qualified to deal with this tonight.

Mrs. Kelley questioned if he visited and walked the site.

Mr. Koutouzakis answered yes.

Mrs. Kelley questioned if he observed anything that was mentioned in these letters on the site.

Mr. Koutouzakis answered no.

Mrs. Kelley mentioned that she read that either the DEP or Wildlife sent somebody out to address it.

Mr. Koutouzakis stated he doesn't believe they sent someone out but reviewed the sightings reports that were submitted.

Mrs. Kelley questioned what data was used to write the report.

Mr. Koutouzakis stated he used data from the NJDEP Landscaping Project version 3.3, Natural Heritage Database that is NJDEP, and as well as conferring with NJDEP Division of Fish and Wildlife endangered and non-game species program personnel regarding their processes of processing citing reports. The Fish and Wildlife has a mapping program the information planning and consultation website. That is the data used to prepare this report along with his experience in preparing environmental impact statements and again working with either state or federal agencies if need be.

Mrs. Kelley questioned if he had seen the letter from the resident.

Mr. Koutouzakis stated he did.

Mrs. Kelley questioned if he contact the resident.

Mr. Koutouzakis stated he did not.

Mrs. Kelley questioned the dates of the maps he was using.

Mr. Koutouzakis explained NJDEP Landscaping Project version 3.3 is 2017, IPAC is an online and is unsure if there is a date for the federal teeny species database that is available, but the NJ database typically the landscape project and the natural heritage database is a database of threatened endangered species in NJ, they mirror each other. The state takes sighting reports that are submitted and vets them and either accepts or rejects them. Then eventually those sightings can be put in the databases in the landscape project. Based on the timing of these reports and working with the DEP, he needed to

find out if they looked at these sighting reports to find out what the situation was with that.

Mrs. Kelley expressed again that she was not happy with receiving the report so late. It was by email and she has to limit her screen time. She came to get a hard copy from the township today. She feels she did not have adequate time as the chairperson of the environmental commission and as a member of this board.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated in speaking with Mr. Aivazoglou he was under the impression that the meeting was the first Wednesday of the month and found out 4 days ago it was tonight. The rushed request on this report was due to Mr. Koutouzakakis would not be available next week and would of moved it to August and you wanted to move this thing forward.

Mr. Aivazoglou agreed.

Mr. Sturm commented that this was not a condition of the Board, this was something they decided they should do and did. Mr. Gravelin was involved with three other environmental companies trying to engage them going back two, three months and there was a problem them accepting work for various reasons. Basically because the COVID situation and the time period they said they would need. Some indicated it may be 60 days before they could do it. Since they were scheduled to appear before this board on the May date and comments by the neighbor came in two or three days before the meeting. They postponed that meeting in order to address it. They were fortunate to get Mr. Koutouzakakis because of his time table and ability to do it for this meeting. He apologized for the lateness but as indicated that it is a volunteered effort to assist the board with the letter and information submitted. This normally doesn't happen and they had to work around what they had and really didn't want to postpone this for another month.

Mrs. Kelley commented that Mr. Koutouzakakis stated he did not contact the resident and yet part of her report is in your report.

Mr. Koutouzakakis stated yes. The letter she submitted is in the attachments. That is the primary reason and the focus of his assessment.

Mrs. Kelley stated she believes her original date is July 2.

Mr. Koutouzakakis commented that is when submitted to township but the sightings were January 1st or 2nd 2020.

Mr. Koutouzakakis explained that some of the information has already been covered. Generally speaking to address the letter that was submitted to the township. Mrs. Sauoaf states based at looking at databases such as fish and wildlife service database. She makes a statement that there are threatened and endangered species on the site. He stated that for the federal database and even the state databases, when you put an inquiry in for the property that does not mean that the species is located on the site. It means that the species may be in the vicinity and there might be an impact. So there might be grounds for a project review by whatever organization has jurisdiction over those species whether they are federally or state listed.

He started his assessment with looking at the existing NJDEP mapping for threatened endangered species for the site. The existing mapping again, it's in the report. He doesn't have figures to put up. The existing mapping doesn't have any habitat for threatened endangered species mapped on the parcel at all. The closest map habitat has to do with bald eagle and great blue heron, which is associated with the Rancocas Creek and off site.

If you go in the federal databases (US Fish and Wildlife Services) and put the project in will come back with four potential species that may be present in the site area. They are 2 animal species, the northern long-eared bat, the bog turtle, and 2 plant species, swamp pink and sensitive joint veg. While taking a look at the report that gives you a base to go by. Meaning the federal government has some records maybe in the vicinity and would be looking to see if a project may potentially impact these species. When looking at a project and making an analysis, there are times when you can make a no effect determination for a species based on certain factors of the project location, habitat and such. One example being the northern long-eared bat. NJ has a list of municipalities that have maternity or hibernation occurrences of Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat. On that list they are going to list per county each of the townships that they know of that have any of these sightings. Hainesport is not on that list. A township could be on the list and then it could be even emphasized on that list if they know that there are hibernation or colony locations. Neither is the case for Hainesport. The federal government are not going to be interested in a consultation on this based on the fact that Hainesport is not on that list. Therefore, you can make a determination that there is a no effect on a species like the northern long-eared bat based on existing information.

The other three species on the federal list for the project, the bog turtle and the two plants. All three of those species are wetland species. Critically dependent on wetlands and waters for survival. Other state databases have no wetlands mapped on the site. He did not see any indications there was any wetlands on his site walk. You can make the determination that there is going to be no impacts to these species that are dependent on these wetlands since there is no wetlands on this site. Swamp pink are along site of slow moving streams and there are none on site. He is a US Fish and Wildlife service qualified bog turtle surveyor. He knows how to delineate wetlands and identify wetlands that are suitable for bog turtles. There are no wetlands on the site. Swamp pink and sensitive joint veg grows in wetlands 99% of the time, so from a federal standpoint there should be no impact on any of those species. That is one of the conclusions that he comes to in his assessment.

Before coming to any conclusions regarding any additional species, barred owl and redheaded woodpecker were not listed on any databases for being on the site. These sighting reports were submitted to the state and to the township. He needed to figure out what the status was with the sighting reports. The state biologists look at each instance and make a determination based on their criteria of whether they are going to accept or reject the sightings. He spoke with biologist there and for the last year and half have not done much in assessing the sighting reports based on the pandemic. They did unearth these two sighting reports from under a pile and have their people look at them. In one of the attachments in the correspondences to the report, the NJDEP biologists are accepting the barred owl sighting but rejecting the re-headed woodpecker sighting. There are currently no databases showing this because it is all new information. The databases are a place to start. They are proceeding under the assumption that there is the possibility of

having barred owl out on this site. The NJ law is set up to protect endangered species meaning not to harass, kill, capture, hunt, or attempting to do so.

His client is going to proceed based on the assumption that the barred owl might be present on the site. The way to prevent a take of a bird species that may be nesting on the site is to not damage any potential areas where they might be nesting. The Fish and Wildlife service recommends April 1st through August 31st to protect migratory nesting birds but to go a little further into it because there is some literature that have barred owls nesting and laying eggs in NJ and NY area into March. They make the recommendation that the client have a restricted cutting window not removing trees from the site from March 1st to August 31st. Not disturbing or any take that potentially to any barred owls that might potentially be present or nesting on the property.

Mr. Koutouzakakis summarized that currently the NJ State databases do not have anything mapped on site. However, NJ has accepted the sighting report for the barred owl and rejected the sighting report for the re-headed woodpecker. Federal databases had the four species that he mentioned and has addressed why there would be no impact to those species. With the assumption that barred owl may be present on site, the recommendation is the restricted cutting window.

Mr. McKay stated that included in the report exhibit b of the report an email from Gretchen Fowls from NJ Fish and Wildlife. Is she the one that said the state rejected the woodpecker sighting? Did she give any reasons why?

Mr. Koutouzakakis answered yes. He is not sure what made them accept or reject. The only thing he knows is that the closes redheaded woodpecker mapped is farther away than the closest barred owl habitat. He believes the barred owl is less than a mile away and the redheaded woodpecker is closer to two to three miles from the site. He does not want to speak for the state in terms of their processes. He knows they look at many different factors.

Mr. McKay stated hypothetically, if they accepted the woodpecker as well, would the mitigation efforts for the woodpecker be the same or similar to the barred owl.

Mr. Koutouzakakis answered yes.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that the woodpecker would be May 10 through September 10 according to the report. If the applicant agreed to extend it to September 10th, then we covered the owl and maybe the woodpecker.

Mrs. Kelley commented that if Mrs. Saouaf is present, she should have an opportunity to question Mr. Koutouzakakis.

Sandra Saouaf was sworn in. She stated she was born and raised in Hainesport and currently resides on Bancroft Lane. She supplied the information in your packet on July 2, 2020 to the board via the secretary and July 5, 2020 to the planner. This was to alert the board after coming to all the Diamantis meetings about federally protected and threatened species that when one looks at that specific parcel, Block 100 Lot 8.03. It is not wetland but is upland. When you do that on the federal data base it pops up (quoted) "known or expected to be on or near the project area the following species, these are

three federally protected species. For mammals it is the northern long-eared bat, reptiles is the bog turtle which happens to be endangered in NJ as well as on the federal protected threatened list. The flowering plant of the swamp pink. She spoke to the NJDEP in December of 2019 soon after R & M Development came to the Joint Land Use Board. She was told that their databases have not been updated in some time. She believes Mr. Koutouzakis said it was 2017. Originally she was told it was 2001 but it has been updated to some degree. She has heard the barred owl continuously since she has lived on Bancroft Lane which has been the past 4 years. It has a distinctive noise it makes. She put the sighting report into NJDEP and was told they would send someone out, his name was Maurice. In the R & M report, Mr. Koutouzakis has a letter in exhibit B that NJDEP expert accepted the sighting records for the barred owl is being present on the proposed development site which is Block 100 Lots 8.03 & 8.02. That has been confirmed. That same exhibit that EcolSciences provided for R & M Development shows that NJ endangered species bog turtle, long-eared bat, swamp pink, and sensitive joint veg has threatened US species is known or expected to be on or near the project area. So the sighting records for the threatened barred owl and the known are expected presence of the bog turtle, the northern long-eared bat, swamp pink remain as a valid concern. She asked that they please do not provide approval for the development without seriously addressing the issues posed by threatened and endangered species. Mr. Koutouzakis said there are some windows that you had to watch out for migratory birds. For instance the barred owl is not a migratory bird so their window of sensitivity may be different.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated he was not talking about migratory, he was talking about breeding. Which was April through August 31 and backed it a month to include March.

Mrs. Saouaf questioned is that for migratory species because the barred owl is not a migratory species.

Mr. Koutouzakis stated if it is not breeding on the site there is no take.

Mrs. Saouaf questioned how do we know? Its presence has been confirmed by NJDEP.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that she is raising some valid points but through their representative the applicant has agreed to not disturb the trees because of the possible problem or the take during that breeding period. So we do not have an issue with that. We clarified the redheaded woodpecker is an extra 10 days so they've agreed not to knock down trees to possibly disturb the breeding and have it qualify as a take until after September 10th. It raises a question that the redheaded woodpecker doesn't have a calendar, they do not know the difference between days. We are trying to go with the professionals representations.

Mrs. Saouaf understands that the township has interest in having access via Bancroft Lane to the proposed park along the creek. Has the JLUB considered purchasing maybe via grant the small strip of land to provide this access that is desired off Bancroft Lane and leaving the remaining part which is environmentally sensitive on these 11 plus acres as wooded habitat for the threatened barred owl, the federally protected NJ endangered bog turtle.

Mr. Krollfeifer explained that there is time to discuss under public comment. He invited her up to be able to ask questions of their professional since she wrote the letter.

Mrs. Saouaf stated in the vicinity that is outlined on the federal database you properly outlined Block 100 Lots 8.03 & 8.02 as she did and it is upland territory. That federal database still identified the same species for both of them as being (quote) known or expected to be on or near the project area. That indicates to her this is known when you draw this line around this proposed developed lot it is upland and know it. Yet they still identify these as species of concern. They are threatened and federally protected so they could be there. She believes more in-depth analysis need to potentially be performed before you ok a development.

Mr. Koutouzakis stated just to repeat there is an algorithm that goes into all these threatened and endangered species databases. If you put the wetlands next to the site, typically you are going to get those same species come up. If you put in an upland area across the street, it's more of a radius that they put based on known sightings in the federal database. They put a radius on it and any areas that you put in are going to come up as a quote on quote a hit. The language they use, unfortunately, says known to occur but if you talk to anyone in the US Fish and Wildlife services. If you get past a certain point like there are wetlands on site maybe they would be interested in a consultation. Him going on site and saying that these do not look good for bog turtles. We don't have any of that for these species and the bat is an issue of itself. We're nowhere near these species. State databases usually are a little better in terms of their location for known mapping of locations. None of these species were mapped in the state databases anywhere nearby the site. We know these will eventually are going to change with these new sightings of the barred owl. He is not sure how long before the state gets that into one of their next version of the landscape project or natural heritage database. We know that the sight was accepted so that is how they are proceeding assuming the barred owl are present. He believes he showed that there would not be any take to these species.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that the Rancocas Creek is relatively close to this property and questioned in his professional opinion qualify as a wetlands.

Mr. Koutouzakis stated sure it's going to be a riparian quarter but he hasn't seen the edge of it and what it looks like in terms of the different habitats even within wetlands and waters.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned if it is fresh water that he is talking about.

Mr. Koutouzakis answered yes but he knows there is one population of bog turtles on the Rancocas Creek but not nearby the site. They are generally fresh water species.

Mrs. Kelley stated that she grew up maybe within 2,000 feet of this property. At one time all this ground was owned by a company that her great-grandfather worked for. Her Uncle took over the Hainesport area. She grew up on Route 38. She had incidents of the swamp pink in her backyard. It appears no matter what you say the developers come in and clear cut. She is very trustworthy of Mr. Taylor, he has put forth a lot of effort into the trees. However there are things on that land. They were yelled at as a child if they touched the swamp pink. She has no problem with losing some trees. The problem is the timing of all these reports. It was known and not addressed until the last minute. She is glad the diner went in and love to eat there and that changes and understands that you can lose trees for a project. She doesn't understand the way the developer came in and disrespected them by hiring Mr. Koutouzakis so late.

Mrs. Kelley questioned Mr. Taylor that when they are getting ready to cut will he be over seeing it or who is so they don't go in and clear cut.

Mr. Taylor explained that there are notes on the plans, the ordinance requires, it's been in his their reports, and it's reflected on their current plans that they will stake the clearing limits in the field. They will be approved by his office prior to any clearing. One of the reasons they do that is there might be a great 18' tree near the limit of clearing so if they can move that fence around a few feet it creates some benefit. That tree protection fencing will be installed prior to any of the land clearing. It is marked on the plan. Mr. Miller brings that up at the pre-construction meeting with the applicant. The applicant has suggested that they would not do any of the clearing from March 1 to August 31st. He believes they agreed that it could be extended until September 10th, as requested by the chairman.

Mr. Sturm stated that is accurate.

Mr. Sturm asked at this time that the board consider approving the major final subdivision and a waiver request.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated you are seeking approval subject to Mr. Miller's, Mr. Taylor's and Mr. Kingsbury's letters and to extend to September 10th to cover the woodpecker.

Mr. Sturm stated yes and all the stipulations that Mr. Gravlin made with regard to the reports by Mr. Miller and Mr. Taylor.

Mr. MacLachlan commented that this has to be one of the strangest applications he has seen in 20 years. Every time you turn the corner, you have to do a traffic study and at the last minute you find wildlife on there. He watches on facebook a little and somebody made a comment that some of the surrounding areas might have chased some of the wildlife onto this property. Now the applicant is having a hard time developing his property. We are all witnessing the changes rapidly happening. He believes Paparone, next door, cut down every trees and is putting back a lot of trees. He is unsure if Paparone had a traffic study for his houses. There does need to be some confirmation on the part of some residents for this applicant to develop there. The applicant has owned it for many years and had the foresight, as testified, to know they were going to develop it 25 years ago to get this easement. He is like some of the residents that he doesn't necessarily like seeing the urbanization of Hainesport. He believes this is a good project.

Mr. Krollfeifer commented that how many applicants come in with a development that incorporates them paying for the access to the park.

Mr. MacLachlan stated the town did a great job in making arrangements with this developer to spend lots of money for access to the park. That will be a good thing to happen, giving access to a lot land. Thanks to the applicant's willingness to cooperate.

Mr. McKay commented that nobody can say that the township concerns of the people in the town relative to this development were not thoroughly examined and investigated. The opportunity to speak and object was made available. The residents, some of them, took full advantage of that, as they are entitled to do. The applicant responded as he was entitled to do. These issues have been fully vetted and carefully studied. So no one can

say that this development will be jammed down anyone's throat or approved without substantial due diligence being done. Now it falls upon the board to make a considered judgement on all the evidence laid out in front of them. Witnesses having been called and cross-examined along with statements put on record. This is a long time coming, it started in 2019 and here we are in 2021. They have looked into everything and at the complaints. We have determined some validity in a few and have found some solutions for those and not validity to others. The board needs to make a judgement based upon the science, all the engineering evidence, and we will do that tonight.

Mr. Krollfeifer opened public comment.

Deborah Plaia, 50 Bancroft Lane, was sworn in. She objected to the late submission of the report provided by Mr. Koutouzakakis. The public is supposed to have the opportunity to review it and was not aware that it had been submitted. She would like to revisit the easement of Wharton Place. She did have some equipment issues when Mr. Gravlin was speaking and did lose part of his testimony. Was there a design change with the retention pond and will you no longer going to be using that easement for the stormwater runoff? She is asking that question because last year when they met, raised an issue that still has not been addressed. There was a resolution that was passed in 1998 by the Joint Land Use Board that states on page 6 that all open space including the Lake shall be owned and maintained by the homeowners association to be formed by the applicant's developer. The township will only accept for dedication the internal streets and roadways on the project. Last year when she brought it to everyone's attention it was in the context of the retention pond and the developer focused only on the retention pond and make representations that there would only be a de minimis amount of water that might flow into the Creekview pond. What they have overlooked and not addressed is that the Creekview retention pond is privately owned by the Creekview Homeowners Association. Even if they are only discharging a de minimis amount of water onto a private property, they need an easement. They do not have an easement from the homeowners association. They have had over a year to approach them and have not done so. As of today if there's any intent upon discharging any water into the Creekview pond it is illegal, it is a trespass, and it's the creation of a nuisance. They need an easement that they do not have.

Ms. Plaia commented that everybody who has talked about their engineering report for the new developers retention pond. Creekview has an engineer's report for when that project was developed back in the mid 90's. We don't have an engineering report that discusses the quality and the quantity of water that may be discharged from the new development into the Creekview pond. By law they are required to have by the State of NJ enters the administrative code maybe a requirement and they passed the legislation which has been amended several times. It was originally enacted in 1983 that any developer who builds a property, they have to develop a retention pond and it has to be designed by an engineer. The engineer has to have a report that talks about the quality and quantity of water that is going to be discharge into a pond. They don't have it for the Creekview Pond. The only one they have is from the 90's that only talks about Creekview development and the stormwater runoff. She has no idea with the new homes that are going to be developed what impact from their stormwater runoff will have on Creekview pond. They have representations but no report.

Ms. Plaia stated she is not sure if Mr. Koutouzakis is aware that there are wetlands on the Creekview pond. Mrs. Saouaf is her neighbor and she gave her a map dated May 8, 1996 from when Creekview was being developed. At the time it was called Waters Edge. There is wetlands on Creekview property. She is not an expert in endangered species but she doesn't know how far a bog turtle will migrate from wetlands. Even though there are no wetland on the Diamantis property, there are on adjacent properties. That may be the reason why the federal government has said it. The most important thing is that there is no easement to discharge water into the Creekview pond and they need one.

Mr. Krollfeifer commented that Mr. Gravlin testified. The original retention pond was not going to absorb all of the water coming from this project and that was the purpose of the easement, the runoff, and so forth. Mr. Gravlin modified the plan and it will completely absorb all the water. Take care of the 100 year flood and if they have 9" of water it will still be absorbed on the property.

Mr. Gravlin stated that it correct. It is now designed not to release any water for the 100 year storm event.

Ms. Plaia questioned that the easement will not be used for any water runoff.

Mr. Gravlin explained there will be a stormwater pipe installed in the event of a catastrophic storm beyond the 100 year storm event which they are not required to design for. However, good engineering practice dictates you always provide an emergency outlet in the event of an 11 inch storm event so the water is controlled and will not flood immediate areas. There will be a storm water pipe installed absolutely. Back in the 90's, he met with Princeton Hydro. They are the ones who actually designed all the hydraulics, all the hydrology of the ponds out there. They wanted the water to directly go in there. He had stated the more water they can bring in the better the ponds will be. They have not done that despite his recommendation that they do so. Back then they were going to run the pipes directly into the system but time has gone on and that is no longer possible.

Ms. Plaia commented that Princeton Hydro doesn't own that pond. Creekview Homeowners Association owns it and it is private property. In the rare event there is a stormwater runoff into the pond, they need an easement.

Mr. Gravlin explained that Princeton Hydro were the consultants to Quaker Group who performed all the hydrology analysis of the ponds before all the houses were built and believe they still are. They are probably the premier hydrology firm in NJ.

Ms. Plaia explained Quaker turned the pond over to the homeowners association and do not own it anymore.

Mr. Krollfeifer thanked Ms. Plaia and stated her comments will be taken into consideration.

Ms. Saouaf commented. Regarding what Mr. McKay mentioned that this was a last-ditch effort with regards to the environmental concerns is not true. She looked into this starting December 2019. In June 2020, she attended an environmental commission meeting here in Hainesport. They recommended that she send it to the JLUB and to the planner. She

is unaware why it did not reach the JLUB. In the spring 2021 she attended another environmental meeting. Mayor Gilmore was there and she provided the same information to her. The board did not receive this information until the Mayor forwarded the email to the board in March or April 2021. She doesn't know why they didn't receive it. It went to Mrs. Tiver and Mr. Taylor. Respectfully this is not a last-ditch effort. She understands there is township interest in having access via Bancroft Lane to the proposed park. She questioned if the board has considered purchasing this small strip of land to provide Bancroft Lane access instead of disturbing the 11 plus acres with this development that has its environmentally sensitive and has NJ threatened species of barred owl, federally protected bog turtle, long-eared bat, swamp pink and another plant. Please consider it and do not provide approval for the development without seriously addressing the issues posed by these threatened and endangered species.

Mr. Krollfeifer closed public comment.

Mr. MacLachlan understanding that this environmental study was voluntarily performed on the part of the applicant.

Mr. Taylor stated that there was no requirement because they don't require any wetlands permits. They technically don't have to apply to DEP for a full threatened and endangered species review under DEP. We had to do that with a lot of county parks they have designed. We as a courtesy when we received the email, sent it to the applicant. They should be in a position to at least be able to respond to this because the board will probably want an answer to it. The applicant took it upon themselves to have the study done. Our ordinance doesn't require that study to be done to be able to address that comment of Ms. Sauoaf. In the spirit of trying to resolve those outstanding issues.

Mr. MacLachlan commented that he is satisfied with the testimony of the expert. He personally does not have the experience. He asked if we are open for a motion.

Mr. Krollfeifer answered yes and that the motion include everything we have talked about tonight has to be approved by Mr. Miller, Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Kingsbury on the appropriate issues mentioned. Mr. Kingsbury on this easement issue if he is satisfied, that will take care of it and likewise for Mr. Taylor and Mr. Miller.

Mrs. Kelley questioned that if for any reason these detention ponds fail, can it be put in an ordinance that they have to be assessed a payment to be paid to the homeowners association for the care of the pond.

Mr. Kingsbury explained that they have designed the retention basin to the limit of what they're required to do. You cannot make them exceed the requirements. If there is some kind of excess spill that damages an adjoining property then the adjoining property owner can take action against them. He believes the board cannot make them go beyond what the regulations require.

Mr. Taylor believes they already have gone above and beyond the actual stormwater management regulations.

Mr. Miller commented that they have gone beyond with the basin. As with any basin, if there's a failure and damages some other property that property owner has the right to sue or assess the basin of owner to make good on damages. That is a legal question.

Mr. McKay motioned to grant final major subdivision, a waiver from the tree ordinance 104-114 as discussed with our planner during this hearing, subject to the representation that the applicant will follow all the recommendations in the last Alaimo letter and Taylor Design letter dated March 31, 2021, as a further condition of approval that the applicant will work with our planner to mitigate further the tree waiver by use of saplings and seedlings as may be determined by our planner especially in the area of the detention basin, further condition the developer will adhere to the woodpecker mitigation recommendations for no tree cutting during the periods discussed ending on the extended September 10th.

Mr. Taylor commented that they need to provide an easement for their development sign located on the adjacent property.

Mr. McKay added it to his motion along with the placement and lighting on that sign be subject to approval by Taylor Design Group.

Second: Mr. Krollfeifer

Roll call: Mr. McKay, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes; Mr. MacLachlan, yes;
Mayor Gilmore, yes; Mr. Tricocci, yes; Mrs. Kelley, no, She is very conflicted on the motion. Not the motion itself or the environment itself but because of the way it was done. It is a matter of trust from what they did in 2003 when they came in for the diner and that the report said they will cut only a little bit and they clear cut. She agrees with moving forward but not with the number proposed. Things change and life goes on; Mrs. Baggio, yes;
Mr. Bradley, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes

Motion carries to approve.

B. Case 21-09: Philadelphia Hardware Group

Block 98 Lot 2.04

3 Mary Way

Use variance

Attorney: Patrick McAndrew

Proper notice was given.

Mayor Gilmore motioned to carry the application to the August 4, 2021.

Second: Mr. Krollfeifer

Roll call: Mayor Gilmore, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes; Mr. MacLachlan, yes;
Mr. McKay, yes; Mr. Tricocci, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes;
Mr. Bradley, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes

Motion carries.

Short break, resumed at 9:05pm.

C. Referral of Longbridge Redevelopment Plan
Block 103.01 Lots 1 & 8
Block 113 Lot 4.05

Mr. Taylor explained that the Committee asked the Joint Land Use Board by resolution to undertake an investigation to determine whether a total of 17 various parcels, about 42 acres, meets the statutory criteria under the local redevelopment and housing law to be considered either an area in need of rehabilitation or an area in need of redevelopment without condemnation. As the board may recall, we had a couple of hearings in 2020 where we evaluated those parcels. Those recommendations were sent back to the governing body which designated the parcels in accordance with those recommendations. Some as areas in need of redevelopment including the properties that we will discuss this evening and the secondarily the residential properties along Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road as areas in need of rehabilitation.

We are here to address a redevelopment plan for three of those parcels, which is the next step in the process. The parcels are a, d, and q from the prior investigation report, which total about 22.56 acres. It includes two lots on Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road. One is a single family residence owned by the applicant and potential redeveloper. Remainder of a is known as the Longbridge Farms property. There was a brief presentation at the Joint Land Use Board investigation hearing. The plan addresses the statutory criteria for the statutory requirements of the local redevelopment and housing law. Essentially it is one the creation of three new additional single family homes along Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road, the extension of a new road partially into the site that will be developed with townhouses. The architectural that is included is what will be presented and proposed. The proposed road will align across from Easton Way and will have no connection to Route 38. The redevelopment plan reduces the area for the R1 residential along Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. It creates the Longbridge townhouses zoning district. The balance of the property is along the Route 38 frontage and a small section frontage on Fostertown Road will be rezoned to the Longbridge redevelopment area, highway commercial zoning district. They set forth the permitted uses, density, and the design standards for the overall project and the two new zoning districts.

Page 17 of the Longbridge Redevelopment Plan has a concept plan that shows the anticipated redevelopment. In the Longbridge area redevelopment district uses, we are permitting all uses within the highway commercial with the exception of telephone central offices, municipal facilities, and indoor recreation areas greater than 10,000 square feet. Also permitted are health and fitness facilities including gyms, yoga studios, microbreweries, congregate care facilities, and a stormwater management basin. The basin will be shared between both the townhouses and non-residential development. There is also permitted conditional uses of fast food and gasoline station with convenience store with an extensive list of conditions. They would have to abide by the conditions or an amendment would need to be done to the redevelopment plan. The design and bulk standards have been set for the townhouses. This is step 9 or 10 of 11.

We are here tonight just for a master plan consistency and a referral which will be adopted as an ordinance by the Township Committee. They worked hard with the developer to get a nice architectural product for the townhouses as well as significant landscaping and buffer standards. He believes this advances several of the town's master

plan objectives to try and stimulate the growth along Route 38 corridor. This provides opportunity for current and future residents. The overall economic development is Consistent with many of the recommendations of plan goals and objectives of the master plan and re-examination. He does not believe there are any elements of the redevelopment plan that are inconsistent with the master plan.

Mr. McKay questioned the estimated sale price of the townhouses and how this townhouse proposal interfaces with our obligations.

Mr. Taylor explained that the sale price wasn't discussed and could be asked at the time of the site plan hearing. The applicant will be required to provide 15% of the townhouse units will have to be affordable units.

Mr. McKay questioned if they could do an in lieu of affordable units.

Mr. Taylor stated that that would be the governing body and there are issues associated with that and fair share housing and courts are not always in favor.

Mr. McKay questioned if these are fee simple townhouses.

Mr. Taylor answered yes.

Mr. MacLachlan commented that the Township Committee is working very hard to adhere to any opportunities for affordable housing at this time.

Mr. McKay stated that we should not put all the affordable housing in the same block.

Mr. Taylor commented that we have had that conversation with the developer and are completely understanding. They will be integrated within the other buildings.

Mr. McKay questioned if the convenience store gas station is an approved use.

Mr. Taylor stated it would be a conditionally permitted, so not permitted outright. He referred to page 18. The gas station convenience store and fast food would have to meet the enumerated conditions.

Mrs. Baggio stated that she also has an issue because it is directly across the street from The Glen at Masons Creek.

Mr. McKay would like to see a list of what is in and out for that section. He believes the impact in that particular location goes far beyond the site because across the street you have heavy residential there, heavy residential along Fostertown Road, and the Chase behind that. Those kind of things send out a lot of light and noise.

Mr. Taylor explained that in other towns he works they use design standards about full cut off so that doesn't occur. They did put in that any drive-thru shall be at least 200' from a residential lot and a buffer of at least 100' in total width, etc. It is a concern. The way the redevelopment subcommittee looked at it is that this has always been zoned as highway commercial. Development for retail uses has languished throughout the United States. It has for office uses as well. In an effort to try to stimulate potential future

development here, it was determined appropriate to try to create a little bit of expansion of some of those uses.

Mrs. Kelley questioned how close the boundary line is to the house on Road A.

Mr. Taylor explained that it was their engineer's depiction of the existing zoning designation. The different colors are what the new zone lines and zoning designations will be. The 4 lots across the front are all R1, green area is the townhouse zone, and the pink up top.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that where the townhouse section is, we are adding residential and losing highway commercial.

Mr. Taylor stated we are and is something the redevelopment committee struggled with. Because of that large finger of wetland in the middle of the site, it created this long deep wedge of highway commercial which is very difficult to develop.

Mr. Krollfeifer commented that there will only be foot traffic from the residential to the commercial.

Mr. Taylor explained that there will be no vehicles access, just a foot path which they have put a requirement for a pedestrian footpath. At the time of site plan approval, a fire review may want to have an emergency gate and an access drive between the two. Mr. Taylor continued that we are here for master plan consistency and once this gets developed every piece of this will come back to the board for subdivision and/or site plan approval.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned where the two open spaces will be that is referenced on page 16.

Mr. Taylor referred to page 14. The townhouse have their own lot and the two lots are in the perimeter of the green. It will be the homeowner's association common area.

Mrs. Baggio stated that in a fee simple the homeowner is usually responsible for maintain the exterior of their property. Overtime they could become unsightly if everyone does not keep up with their piece. Why would you go fee simple rather than condominium where the association would collect the fees to maintain the exterior of the buildings?

Mr. Taylor commented that this a business question. He has seen about 10,000 unit and all have been fee simple, none have been condominiums with exterior façade maintenance.

Mrs. Baggio stated that the townhouses at the Glen are all fee simple and the HOA fees do not include maintenance of any exterior of the building. They are all affordable housing and if they need a new roof or something, it's on the individual homeowner.

Mr. Taylor understands and this project would only have 7 units of affordable housing and all the others would be market rate units.

A discussion occurred regarding fee simple, HOA, and affordable housing.

Mr. Taylor explained that most developers know now that a strong HOA document ensures the aesthetics and the character of the community. It help to keep it self-regulating.

Mr. McKay questioned who would control that wetlands finger or will it be considered open space. Who will police it so that it does not become a dump?

Mr. Taylor answered that a portion of that is included on the townhouse lot as residential open space. The balance will be on the commercial property. They see it less with places that have a HOA. Their property line ends 31' from the back of their deck. Sometimes when single families back up to wetlands, people build a little shed and dump their leaf clippings.

Mr. McKay questioned if there is a thought to having the wetlands become a green strip area that could be utilized by the public as a park. Maybe if the town would accept it, have the developer deed it to the town.

Ms. Kosko commented that it is wetlands.

Mr. Taylor explained that in concept it makes sense for a nice small neighborhood natural area for the residents who live here. Having the lawn area right near the wooded area for the townhouse people, would be a great spot to have a picnic, throw a Frisbee, or do some stuff in that lawn area. The problem with opening that up to the public is it backs up to a lot of single family homes and homes in this community. It would be problematic for the township to manage and maintain because it is so isolated.

Mr. Krollfeifer referred to page 17 and the shared basin. Who will maintain it since it is shared.

Mr. Taylor explained that it will be figured out during site plan approval. There will need to be agreements in place between the commercial developer, the residential developer, and the HOA for ongoing responsibilities and maintenance. It will probably be based on the percentage of volume.

Mr. Krollfeifer referred to page 20 under D. It says 20% and he believes he stated it was 15%.

Mr. Taylor stated that is a typo and will be corrected. Back on page 27 is where the correct number of 15% is.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that Mr. Taylor did a great job on the booklet. The board agreed.

Mr. Kingsbury stated that the motion is that it is consistent with the master plan.

Mr. McKay motioned to approve referral to Township Committee

Second: Mr. Bradley

Roll call: Mr. McKay, yes; Mr. Bradley, yes; Mr. MacLachlan, yes; Mayor Gilmore, yes; Mr. Tricocci, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries.

7. Minutes

A. Meeting Minutes of May 5, 2021

Motion to approve: Mrs. Kelley

Second: Mrs. Baggio

Roll call: Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mr. MacLachlan, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mayor Gilmore, yes; Mr. Tricocci, yes; Mr. Bradley, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve

8. Resolutions

A. Resolution 2021-11: Our Lady Queen of Peace

Granting use variance for expansion of activities and services at existing parish center on Block 91 Lot 3

Motion to approve: Mrs. Kelley

Second: Mrs. Baggio

Mr. Krollfeifer referred to the minutes where he stated there should be a sign of no left turn out on Lumberton Road. The resolution states Marne Highway, that sign is in place. Mr. Kingsbury stated that needs to be corrected.

Mrs. Kelley amended the resolution to include the change.

Second: Mrs. Baggio

Roll call: Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mr. Tricocci, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve

B. Resolution 2021-12: Frank Pallente

Granting minor subdivision approval of Block 18 Lots 17, 18, 19, and 20

Motion to approve: Mr. MacLachlan

Second: Mr. McKay

Roll call: Mr. MacLachlan, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mayor Gilmore, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. Tricocci, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve.

9. Correspondence

A. Letter dated April 29, 2021 from Burlington Co. Planning Board to Mrs. Tiver
Re: Phillips Road Tract Block 110 Lots 10, 10.02, & 10.03

B. Letter dated May 19, 2021 from Burlington Co Planning Board to Mr. Cammarata
Re: 2303 Marne Hwy site plan, Block 67 Lot 16

- C. Letter dated May 24, 2021 from Taylor Design to Mrs. Newcomb
Re: Hainesport Commerce Center Block 83.01 Lots 1-3; Block 96 Lot 1;
Block 96.01 Lot 1
- D. Letter dated May 24, 2021 from Alaimo Association to Mr. Blair
Re: Hainesport Commerce Center-Temporary Certificate of Occupancy
- E. Letter dated June 14, 2021 from H. Krollfeifer to Mr. Latourette, NJDEP
Re: Township of Hainesport 2021 Green Acres Development Application
- F. Public Notice to Neighboring Landowners dated June 16, 2021 from Bluewater
Property Group LLC
Re: 710 Marne Hwy., Block 24 Lots 12.01, 12.02, 12.03, 12.04, 12.05, 11, 4.01

Motion to accept and file: Mrs. Kelley

Second: Mr. MacLachlan

Roll call: Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. MacLachlan, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mayor Gilmore, yes;
Mr. Tricocci, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mr. Bradley, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes;
Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries.

10. Professional Comments - None

11. Board Comments

Mrs. Kelley questioned if the board could do a resolution that if a developer comes in with more than 5 houses, they would have to put forth an environmental study.

Mr. Kingsbury stated it could be part of an ordinance requirement adopted as such by the governing body.

Mrs. Kelley stated she will bring it up there.

Mr. Taylor stated that it is already in there. They had requested a partial waiver of the EIS for this project and asked if they could rely on the report from the diner.

12. Public Comments

Mr. Krollfeifer opened public comment. None. Closed public comment.

13. Adjournment

Mrs. Baggio motioned to adjourn at 9:50pm.

Second: Ms. Kosko

Roll call: All in favor

Paula L Tiver, Secretary