

**HAINESPORT TOWNSHIP JOINT LAND USE BOARD
MINUTES**

Time: 7:30 PM

Wednesday, January 6, 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. Tiver, Mr. Katz,

Absent: Mr. McKay

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

6. Items for Business

**A. Case 15-05A: Diamantis Children’s Trust
Block 100 Lot 8.01
1386 Route 38
Preliminary & Final Site Plan with Bulk Variances – Pep Boys
Attorney: Igor Sturm, Esq.**

Proper notice was given

Mr. Sturm explained the application is for a preliminary and final site plan for Block 100 Lot 8.01. A variance is needed for signage.

Mr. Kingsbury swore in the following witnesses: Joseph Walsh, Director of Real Estate of Pep Boys. Joseph Diamond, Construction Manager of Pep Boys. Mark Raiken, Broker. Jack Gravlin, Engineer.

Mr. Walsh gave some background on Pep Boys. They have two kinds of centers. One is what they call their supercenter and the other is a smaller service and tire center. The service and tire center is a 6 bay unit that is approximately 5,500 square feet. The closest one now is in Maple Shade. They are proposing their new concept of the service and tire center here. This is the prototypical building and signage. They would be very visible from Route 38 coming from either direction. There would be 5 employees. A service manager, a mechanic, and service technicians. Hours of operation would be Monday thru Friday 7am to 7pm, Saturday 7am to 6pm, and Sunday 9am to 4pm. No engine or transmission overhauls, bodywork, or painting would be done at the site.

Mr. Boettcher questioned if the electronic sign was a flashing or movable letters.

Mr. Walsh answered no, they are stationary.

Mr. Dodulik questioned if there were any potential renters for the additional space.

Mark Raiken stated he is the broker on record. We are waiting for the Planning Board to make a ruling so they can look at what the lease spaces will look like. They have been talking to a cell phone store and other convenient type retailers, possibly a dry cleaner.

Mr. Katz stated it would be Pep Boys and 4 other stores.

Mr. Diamantis stated the others would be 1,500 sq. ft. each.

Mr. Krollfeifer referred to the signage.

Mr. Walsh explained that there are two elevations that will house that sign. He pointed out that one elevation faces the Diner and the other faces Route 38.

Mr. Gravlin explained that there will be 3 signs that total 125 sq. ft.

Mr. Katz asked that the elevation be marked as A1.

Mr. Krollfeifer asked for clarification that they are looking for 125 sq. ft. for three signs instead of the 80 sq. ft.

Mr. Walsh stated that is correct.

Mr. Katz asked Mrs. Wuebker to address her Ragan Design review letter dated October 19, 2015.

Mrs. Wuebker stated that the applicant has asked for a waiver from the Environmental Impact Statement since they submitted an extensive report for the original development of the restaurant on the adjacent land.

Mrs. Kelley believes one is not warranted since it was looked at before and it is probably one of the highest elevations in Hainesport.

Mrs. Wuebker explained that a lot of the issues have been addressed that were in her review letter. One issue remaining is that the signs above the bay doors were not calculated in the signage. In speaking with Mr. Gravlin earlier, he will give testimony.

Mr. Gravlin stated they will not be placing the signs above the bay doors. It is on the architectural rendering and will be removed.

Mr. Katz questioned if the garage doors will be facing the diner and not the street.

Mr. Gravlin stated that is correct.

Mrs. Wuebker asked that the freestanding sign lighting be addressed.

Mr. Gravlin explained that the freestanding sign will be set at the corner meeting the setback requirements. It is a conforming sign in regards to area and height. He is not aware of any violations of the township ordinances regarding the LED.

Mr. Katz asked if it would be a permanent sign.

Mr. Gravlin stated it has tubes. It will be permanent and no flashing or motion.

Mr. Katz asked to mark the free standing sign page as exhibit A2 and the elevation sign as A3.

Mrs. Wuebker questioned what the façade lighting would be.

Mr. Gravlin stated there will be façade lighting. They will be sconces and LED lighting aiming directly down. The purpose is to illuminate the sidewalk areas. He will revise his plan to show the illumination levels in the sidewalk areas now that he has the fixture from the architect. It will meet standards.

Mrs. Wuebker explained that there were cross easements that were recorded with the original subdivision. There will be additional easements that would need to be worked out. If the Board should give approval tonight, it could be a condition of approval. They are drainage, utilities, and sidewalk.

Mr. Gravlin explained that they did create cross easements between the subject lot, the diner, and the back lot. There are blanket easements for access, drainage and utilities. It is on the final plan of lots. They will also record by deed.

Mrs. Wuebker believes there are outstanding issues with the fire official.

Mr. Gravlin explained that many revisions to the plan have been done. One of the revisions was to satisfy the fire official's comment. He asked that an additional fire hydrant be installed along the Bancroft frontage. In speaking with him yesterday, he proposed that we put the fire hydrant within the interior of the site. They are in agreement with that. He will change that on the plan.

Mr. Katz asked that the utility plan be marked as A4.

A discussion occurred about the location of fire hydrants.

Mr. Diamantis was sworn in and took part in the discussion.

Mrs. Wuebker stated she was finished with review letter.

Mr. Miller stated that they had many meetings on the drainage issues, mostly with water quality. They have come to an understanding and the plans meet the water quality standards. The perk test needs to be done. We are familiar with the area there and feel that there will be no problems with the percolation tests. They have agreed to do that.

Mr. Gravlin agreed. He stated they have the contract from the soils engineer. They will be doing that in the next several weeks. The information will be provided to the Boards engineer and he will also be called for inspection.

Mr. Gravlin stated this property is 1386 Route 38 eastbound which is an undeveloped corner lot in the highway commercial zone. They recently granted a use variance from the Board for this property and now are back for the site plan. It is very similar to the concept plan that was presented during the use variance. No setback variances are needed. They are proposing to build a 5,566 sq. ft. Pep Boys with a 6,300 sq. ft. attached retail building. The building is designed as a single unit. The parcel will share a common driveway with the diner. They are in the process of obtaining a letter of no interest from DOT, they believe that the driveway will be accepted as it exists. They have complied with all building, parking setbacks, and landscaping along both road frontages. The bay doors will face the diner restaurant. The loading and trash enclosures are screened by landscaping. 66 parking stalls are proposed which meets the requirement of 64. There are cross easements between the properties for access, utilities, and drainage. They will be removing the 38 overflow parking spaces that were installed right after the diner was built. They are not used and the diner parking is adequate and meets township standards.

Mr. Gravlin referred to the drainage plan, exhibit A5. He has spent many hours meeting with the board's engineer. The basin on the diner was designed to handle the drainage from the pad parcel. However different measures are required for water quality and ground water recharge. These are new regulations. He now is directing all the pavement surfaces to a new basin that will be installed along Route 38 frontage. This will meet the requirements for the water quality and ground water recharge. The new basin will drain into the existing basin. The roof drains from the new building will be directed underground by piping to an existing stormwater system that was put in when they built the driveway. He believes the drainage will meet current standards.

Mr. Gravlin referred to the utility plan, exhibit A4. Underground services from Bancroft and Route 38 will service the building. One small section of the sanitary sewer will need to be relocated because it would be underneath the proposed Pep Boys building. He believes only MUA permits are needed. Site lighting will all be LED fixtures, they are full cutoff, night sky friendly, and oriented down at the pavement surfaces. Façade lighting will be provided along the building frontage for the sidewalk illumination. He will add the spec and illumination patterns to the plan.

Mr. Gravlin referred to the landscaping plan, exhibit A6. They are proposing to install approximately 276 trees, shrubs, and buffer plants. The design will provide adequate buffering of the parking and the loading areas and will result in a visually pleasing site. Full irrigation is proposed for all the planting areas.

Mr. Gravlin referred to architectural plan, exhibit A7. They will comply with the townships architectural requirements for the HC zone for 50% brick and glass. The Pep Boys building and the retail building have been designed as a single building to continue

the architectural appearance. Mr. Diamantis will be building a conventional building and not a pre-engineered structure.

Mr. Gravlin continued. The plans that are before the Board tonight are revised plans to conform to the engineers and the planners initial reviews. There are a few minor issues that remain. We are unsure who the tenants will be in the retail area. The parking ratio has been based on a general retail requirement, 5.5 per 1000 square feet. In his experience it would be adequate. Pep Boys was calculated on the service bay requirements. The traffic engineer will comment. He indicated two loading areas on the plan at the back of the building. One will be for the retail and the other will be beside the Pep Boys. Pep Boys prefers not to unload from that location, they would like to bring in a short tractor trailer to unload directly in front of the bays. There will be one delivering a week consisting of two pallets which would take approximately 30 minutes. They are proposing a 6' full width concrete sidewalk along the Route 38 frontage. This will necessitate an easement since it will slightly over hang the right of way onto the property. The required deed will be prepared. Two 10' x 20' trash enclosures are proposed, one for the retail and one for Pep Boys. It will supply adequate space for recycling and solid waste. In the Pep Boys trash enclosure there will be a used tire storage area. There will be a fiberglass roof over the tire section, so water cannot get in the old tires.

Mr. Katz questioned how often that the tires will be removed.

Mr. Diamond stated that it depends on the volume of the store, typically once every two weeks. A higher volume would be picked up once a week.

Mr. Gravlin stated they will provide the soil borings. He will comply with the engineers revised review letter. He asked the Board considering granting preliminary and final site plan approval.

Mr. Clauss questioned the location of the transformer.

Mr. Gravlin stated that their electrical requirement will be below the threshold and will have the transformers on the poles at the service location. From that location they will go underground through the site into the back of the building. He does not anticipate any changes but if it should it would be in the island besides the building and would require him to shift a few plants around.

Mr. Katz questioned if any variances are required.

Mrs. Wuebker stated a sign variance is needed.

Mr. Gravlin explained that only 2 sign variances are needed. Their planner will address it.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned why there was a pipe on the April plan and not the current.

Mr. Gravlin explained that in meetings with Mr. Miller regarding storm water it was agreed that it would be better to go with the concrete instead. So that was removed from plan.

Mr. John Rea, Traffic Engineer, gave his credentials and the Board accepted. He did the traffic analysis and will be required to get the NJDOT approval. There is already a right in and right out on the east bound lane of Route 38 and a side street access from Bancroft Lane. We are adding no new access points. DOT approval is needed since we are adding more retail space and Pep Boys. He has looked at the access permit that was issued to the DOT about ten years ago and the permissible trips that are allowed at the Route 38 access. He believes they will be able to get a letter of no interest. The intersection operates at a level A and believes it will continue to operate as a level A after the project. The side access will operate at a level A. The exit movement to Route 38 will operate at a C level of service during the pm peak hour and a B level service at the Saturday peak hour. They are acceptable levels of service. The site will operate safely and efficiently. There will be no negative impacts to the off-site intersections. The signs are needed due to the 50mph speed on Route 38.

Mrs. Wuebker asked if an AM peak hour was done.

Mr. Rea explained that he did. However, NJDOT only wants the PM when it is retail. He explained the different reasons why. He gave some samples of the trips.

Robert Perry, Planner and Landscape architect. He referred to exhibit A1 which shows the façade signs. There are 3 that equals a total of 125.2 sq. ft. where 80 sq. ft. is allowed. He believes it is consistent with the master plan and the Burlington Counties ideas along our major corridor. DOT suggests eliminating the accesses along Route 38 which this does. The signs allow for safety so that there is no hazard with traffic. It also promotes a visual environment.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that the façade sign that faces the diner will only be seen by the westbound traffic and not the eastbound.

Mr. Perry explained that it will allow the westbound to see the sign and take the jug handle.

Mr. Krollfeifer commented that they will also be able to see the freestanding sign.

Mr. Perry stated that the freestanding sign is a compliant sign that will also include the retail stores.

Mr. Dickinson questioned if the freestanding sign is the same specs as the one in Maple Shade.

Mr. Diamond explained that the one in Maple Shade was a retro fit to the Pier One that was previously there.

Mrs. Kelley asked for the location of the freestanding sign.

Mr. Gravlin explained that it is 15' from the right of way from Bancroft and 15' from the right of way from Route 38.

Mrs. Kelley has concerns with the landscaping that these trees may eventually block the signage.

Mr. Perry explained that the trees are the smaller ornamental trees and the plants behind the sign are smaller shrubs.

Mr. Sturm explained that he will prepare the deeds for the easements. He will also submit the information for maintaining the basin.

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

Mrs. Newcomb questioned what lighting will be staying on all night.

Mr. Lynch left at 8:45

Mr. Gravlin stated there is a note on the plan that the all lights except security lights be extinguished after operational hours. The façade signs will stay on. The lighting in the parking area will be extinguished with the exception of the driveways.

Mr. Krollfeifer motioned to approve.

Second: Mr. Selb

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

Motion carries to approve

B. Case 15-13: UE-00211NJ, LLC dba Unison Energy

Block 96 Lot 1.05

Preliminary & Final Site Plan with Bulk Variance – ShopRite

Attorney: Robert Baranowski, Jr., Esq.

Proper notice was given.

Robert Baranowski, attorney, explained this application pertains to the ShopRite in Hainesport for an amended preliminary and final site plan. It is located on Route 38 in the Crossroads Plaza. There was an approval for an expansion to the ShopRite back on June 5, 2015. The application is only to add generator equipment to the site plan for ShopRite. The Unison energy system consists to a primary and secondary natural gas generator. It will produce on site power, hot water, and heat. It runs parallel to the grid and also functions as a stand-alone system. It can produce enough power to provide all necessary loads if the grid goes down. If power should go down ShopRite would be able to continue to do business and also be available to first responders. The generator will also take a load off the grid during the summer. It is very clean power and it will reduce the carbon footprint of ShopRite by 20 to 40 percent.

Mr. Kingsbury swore in the following: Kim Lingard, Director Project Management for Unison Energy. Brian Conlon, Engineer. Karl Eickhoff, President of Eickhoff Supermarkets.

Mr. Kingsbury explained that the Board's planner has recused themselves due to a conflict.

Mr. Baranowski marked the amended master site plan exhibit A1.

Ms. Lingard gave her credentials. Their generation system is a combine power and heat system. It consists of a 450kw primary generator that is intended to run 24/7. It will give the store its first 400kw of its first power. The backup system is a 400kw system. It is used for any down time such as maintenance. The two generators can work together in the event of a total power outage to completely run the store. There are two boxes 34'x 8' and 12' x 6' and piping between the two systems. They are proposing a cedar board fence to look nice and secure the site. There is a specially made enclosure to help with the sound which maintains a 55 decibel at the source and thirty feet from the source. They have filed with the NJ Dept. of Environmental for this site. This system has been approved by them for 3 other sites. They also qualify for the NJ Clean Energy Fund. There is a fire suppression system with in itself, an internal smoke detector, an automatic gas shut off, and air louver closures for containment in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Baranowski questioned if there was any discharge from the system.

Ms. Lingard stated no, it will be a closed looped dry system. There will be misters to cool the system only when above 82 degrees Fahrenheit. There is no stormwater drainage. There will be no drainage out.

Mr. Baranowski stated the equipment will be 4' from the wall and there is no need for access to the back panel.

Ms. Lingard explained that there is no access from the sides that is against the building.

Mr. Baranowski questioned what type of maintenance needs to be done to the equipment.

Ms. Lingard explained in the beginning they will be out quite a bit to do conditioning. Then it is 4 times a year for regular maintenance. The large generator is a walk in container that has power and light that allows the maintenance to occur inside.

Mr. Katz asked what powers the generator.

Ms. Lingard stated natural gas, combustion engine.

Mr. Clauss questioned if this an emergency or standby generator. Will they have their own egress lighting not depending on the generator?

Ms. Lingard answered neither. Yes they will have their own.

Mr. Clauss questioned their heat recovery.

Ms. Lingard explained its absorption chillers contained within the same enclosure.

Mr. Boettcher questioned if exercising the generator is necessary and when it would be done.

Ms. Lingard explained the main generator is different because it is a 24/7 operation. The second generator is not used it would have to be exercised on a regular schedule.

Mr. Dickinson questioned if the other projects in New Jersey were ShopRite.

Ms. Lingard stated yes and they are about ready to break ground in about two weeks at the new Burlington ShopRite.

Brian Conlon, engineer, gave his credentials. He gave an overview of the site and marked a blowup of the site as A2. There will be an area of about 2,000 sq. ft. of disturbance. The overall size of the equipment is 28' x 56'. Four parking spaces will need to be removed. It will be curbed off and guarded by a 6' cedar board fence. They are not changing impervious coverage. There is a slight increase of .03% which is de minimus. There is no change in stormwater function.

Mr. Baranowski asked him to discuss the impact on the existing parking field.

Mr. Conlon explained the code requires 5.5 spaces per 1000. The overall current site has a total of 1220 spaces. This a 5.12 ratio. It is an existing nonconforming situation. We would be dropping to 1216 spaces, a 5.10 ratio. They are comfortable with that. Today's standards are leaning more to a 4 ratio.

Mr. Krollfeifer believes there would be less need with the pickup area.

Mr. Conlon said there are still parking spaces on the side and if they are full there is plenty of parking in the front.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned if this was replacing equipment.

Mr. Baranowski stated that there was different proposed equipment listed on the plan that never was installed.

Mr. Eickhoff stated that his stores are basically big refrigerators. There currently have a 100kw emergency generator and rely on public utility power. In the event of a power outage the 100kw only takes care of life safety so they can run for a short period of time. It does not take care of any of the refrigerator equipment. This store was out for 18 hours during hurricane Sandy. As a result their overall stores lost about \$400,000 in perishable food. The Shop At Home is averaging 400 orders which is less stress on the parking.

Mr. Baranowski questioned if there would be any detriment impact on traffic circulation on the site or the surrounding roadways.

Mr. Conlon answered that was correct that it has no impact.

Mr. Baranowski asked that he explain the variance needed for the accessory setback.

Mr. Conlon explained that it is set at 4.2' where 10' setback is required. They do not want it to be in the roadway. There were no comments in the fire official's letter regarding it. They are comfortable with the setback.

Mr. Baranowski stated they will comply with the rest of the review letter and they see no issues.

Mr. Dodulik questioned if the donation boxes were ever moved to help free up some parking spaces. It was brought up when ShopRite was here for the expansion.

Mr. Eickhoff stated it is an ongoing conversation with the landlord, DDR. He believes they did relocate one. There is still one in the ShopRite area and he has not been able to get them to move it yet.

Mr. Clauss questioned if the old generator will be removed.

Mr. Baranowski stated it will be removed.

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

Mr. Baranowski asked that they would like the Board not to require county approval or a letter of no interest from the county since this does not affect the county with this small amendment to add the generators.

Mr. Kingsbury stated that the county has its own requirements.

Mr. Baranowski believes that when it does not impact the county, the board can state we are not required to get county approval.

Mrs. Newcomb commented that ShopRite went through a lot with the county for the addition and believes they did not have any say in the addition. The county made Mr. Eickhoff do a tremendous amount of work that had nothing to do with the addition. In her opinion this generator has no impact on the county. She would recommend that they do not impose that on ShopRite to go through that again.

Mr. Kingsbury asked if they are required to submit an application.

Mrs. Newcomb stated they are not on a county road.

Mr. Baranowski agreed.

Mr. Clauss stated that it is only a piece of equipment and the only thing else they would need is an operational permit from the state.

Mr. Baranowski explained they are replacing the generators that are shown on the original plan which was reviewed by the county. It's just a different generator.

Mr. Kingsbury believes this board cannot say whether or not county approval is need. He includes that in his resolutions.

Mr. Baranowski believes the board can say it is not a condition of their approval. There is really nothing for the county to review since the plan had generator equipment on the initial plan. He does not believe they need their approval.

Mr. Kingsbury stated that is his risk to take.

Mr. Baranowski is willing to take that risk if the Board is not compelling him to go back to the County Planning Board. They can supply that they have satisfied any county review requirements from the previous site plan approval.

A preliminary and final approval is needed with 2 variances, one for the setback requirement and one for the parking.

Mr. Krollfeifer motioned to approve the application

Second: Mr. Clauss

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

Motion carries to approve.

C. Administrative Amendment Case 14-01A: 2509 Creek Rd., LLC

Block 104 Lots 2.01, 3.01, 3.02, 4.01, 5.13

Relocate existing garage

Mrs. Newcomb explained that is an administrative amendment. The case was in 2014 which the resolution had a condition to have the garage that straddled two properties be torn down. In speaking with the attorney and applicant, they which to move the garage to the existing house and place on the property which will meet the ordinance. We felt that the Board had to have this resolved by resolution since it was in a prior resolution to remove it.

Mr. Boettcher asked what she was looking for.

Mrs. Newcomb stated this is a two story framed garage.

Mr. Boettcher suggested that they put a stipulation in the resolution that there be no electric, water, or sewer on the second floor like the Board did with a garage application on Albert Street. We do not want anyone living in it.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned if the applicant wanted to build this garage on his property could he do it without coming to the Board.

Mrs. Newcomb answered yes. The only reason it is here is because the prior resolution states they must demolish it.

Mr. Selb believes a condition of approval should be as Mr. Boettcher stated.

Mr. Selb motioned to approve.

Second: Mr. Krollfeifer

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

Motion carries to approve.

D. Discussion on the 2016 Hainesport Joint Land Use Board Annual Report

Mrs. Tiver stated that report is attached to resolution 2016-02. The law requires the Board to take a look at the applications that were heard over the past year to see if there is anything that we are continuously approving that would require us to update our ordinances.

Mrs. Wuebker suggested that the Board may want to consider regulations for ground mounted solar panels. We did have a couple this year.

Mr. Katz prefers that they come in. Many factors come into play such as lot size and how close the neighbors are. Each case needs to be looked at individually.

Mr. Krollfeifer said it also gives the neighbors within 200 feet the opportunity to come in and express their opinions.

Mr. Katz questioned what was happening with Verizon, the Board gave them one year.

Mrs. Newcomb stated that Verizon has contacted her and they will be removing the trailer.

7. Minutes

A. Regular Meeting Minutes of November 4, 2015

B. Executive Meeting Minutes of November 4, 2015

Motion to approve the regular and executive minutes: Mrs. Kelley

Second: Mr. Katz

Roll call: Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. Katz, yes; Mr. Boettcher, yes; Mr. Selb, yes;
Mr. Tiver, yes; Mr. Dodulik, yes; Mr. Clauss, yes

Motion carries to approve

8. Resolutions

A. Resolution 2016-02: Hainesport Joint Land Use Board Adopting 2015 Annual Report

No recommendations

Motion to approve: Mr. Krollfeifer

Second: Mrs. Kelley

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

Motion carries to approve.

9. Correspondence

A. Letter dated October 23, 2015 from NJ Department of Transportation
Re: Block 100 Lot 8.01

B. Letter dated October 26, 2015 from Burlington Co Planning Bd. To Mr. Eickhoff
Re: ShopRite expansion at Crossroads Plaza Release of performance guarantee
Block 96 Lots 1.05, 1.08, 1.09

C. Certification dated November 5, 2015 from Burlington Co Soil Conservation

Re: Block 8 Lot 1.09 – 1507 Deacon Road

D. Letter Dated November 12, 2015 from Alaimo Group to Mr. Selb
Re: Hainesport Joint Land Use Board

E. Letter dated November 17, 2015 from Mr. Sheehan to Judge Bookbinder
Re: I/M/O The application of the Township of Hainesport

Motion to accept and file: Mrs. Kelley
Second: Mr. Katz

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

Motion carries.

10. Professional Comments

Mr. Miller stated that he is trying to work with the applicants prior to the meeting in order to resolve issues so there is not a lot a back and forth at the meeting.

Mr. Katz liked that things are worked out.

11. Board Comments

Mr. Katz read a resignation letter from Gus Bradley. He stated that Mr. Bradley had been with the Board for some time and had some good comments. He will be missed.

Mr. Krollfeifer suggested that we send him a letter.

12. Public Comments – None.

13. Adjournment

Mr. Katz motioned to adjourn at 9:43pm.

Second: Mr. Selb

Roll call: All in favor

Paula L. Tiver, Secretary