

HAINESPORT TOWNSHIP JOINT LAND USE BOARD MINUTES

Time: 7PM

April 6, 2022

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: Mr. McKay, Mrs. Gilmore, Mrs. Baggio, Mrs. Kelley, Mrs. Tyndale, Ms. Kosko, Mr. Krollfeifer, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Murphy

Absent: Mayor MacLachlan, Mr. Tricocci, Mrs. Cuniglio

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

6. Items for Business

A. Case 22-04: Hainesport Enterprises, Inc.

Block 66.01 Lot 5

1466 Route 38

Use Variance for expansion of Nonconforming use and site plan waiver

Attorney: Douglas Heinold

Proper notice was given.

Mrs. Gilmore recused herself due to the application being a use variance. Mrs. Kelley recused herself do to living within 200’ of applicant.

Doug Heinold: Doug Heinold with the firm of Raymond, Coleman, Heinold, in Moorestown, New Jersey representing the applicant, Hainesport Enterprises Inc. I have with me to this evening, Joe Mancini to provide testimony. We've also have Tom

Amendola, in case there's any questions as to operational issues. This property is Block 66.01 Lots 3 and 5, also known as 1466 Route 38. As I'm sure, you know, because it's a fairly visible property on Route 38, there was a fire on the property and a portion of the building that is the subject lot was lost to that fire. The property as impacted was raised in that section. And there was some fairly extensive discussion within Hainesport Enterprises as to how to respond to that and how to rebuild, where to rebuild and so forth. It's my belief that we could have essentially rebuilt exactly what was there before by right and gone right to building permit. But the decision was made to change the footprint and make it two stories across the section that was impacted where it previously had been two stories and then reduced down to one story on a portion of the building. The footprint is actually smaller than the old building, and we'll get into a little bit more detail on that. The area that was impacted was office use, and that is what is being reconstructed and proposed on the site. There was an existing masonry building, attached to and part of a larger building. Again, the office space was what was lost in the fire and is proposed to be rebuilt here. We've had an opportunity to receive your Board professional review letters. There's a proposed 27' by 59' footprint of the new office space. There are some existing nonconformities that are pointed out in Mr. Taylor's review letter that will address ultimately the use as it exists in this site as a preexisting nonconforming use under the zoning. Technically we are expanding a preexisting nonconforming use, because we're changing the layout of what was there prior to the fire. We think that the proposed redevelopment of the site and the footprint at issue is actually going to improve some of the site conditions that were preexisting prior to the fire. So with that, Joe Mancini, if you could have you sworn in.

Mr. Kingsbury: Swore in Joe Mancini.

Mr. Heinold: So just for the purposes of getting your qualifications on the record, can you just speak to your education and your professional background?

Mr. Mancini: Gave his qualifications.

Mr. Heinold: For purposes of testimony tonight, because we're dealing with a D2 we have you both as a professional engineer and as professional planner.

Mr. Mancini: Correct.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Any questions from the Board? Very acceptable. Welcome back.

Mr. Heinold: So, you're familiar with this site and you have not only worked on this site but other portions of the site as well.

Mr. Mancini: That's correct. So, colleague of mine, Mark Schwartz, did some of the earlier applications but I've been involved working with Mark since 2014 on different aspects.

Mr. Heinold: Can you in reference to the exhibits that you have up there, just give an overview to the board as to the area that's impacted.

Mr. Mancini: I am going to mark the variance plans as A1. I have these sk4 architectural renderings. Five sheets I believe is overlapping. So the site's oriented with Route 38 on the left-hand side or north side of the property consists of five which is at the top here and

lot three of which are deeded together. They have frontage to Route 38 and also front at the rear of the property on Greenwood Avenue. The existing office that was raised recently is this location here in blue, smaller new two story framed building proposed as a new office. The existing one story masonry garage was there before and remains now. So both of the existing and proposed conditions of the office would connect with that garage. There is also an additional one story metal building that is one of the repair shops. So there's no changes from the existing condition in terms of the building locations other than the reduction in the footprint of the proposed office. No changes to site circulation. The site still has access from two depressed curb areas in front of each one of those lots, five and three. We are formalizing some of the parking which wasn't previously striped and providing some angled parking along the office building and a dedicated accessible space in front of that building. No other changes to the site from the previously existing conditions.

Mr. Heinold: Can you speak to impervious coverage?

Mr. Mancini: So in both the existing and proposed conditions the site is such a 100% impervious.

Mr. Heinold: Okay, so based on that, no stormwater issues are triggered.

Mr. Mancini: We don't have any increase in impervious coverage, we don't have any more disturbance that would trigger stormwater management requirements.

Mr. Heinold: You mentioned the parking requirement a little bit, can you speak to what the code requires, what we're proposing and, and whether we can address the comments that were raised relative to that.

Mr. Mancini: Code requires, general office use, one space per 250 square feet. The proposed office has a total gross floor area of 2,700 square feet. So that by code will require 11 spaces. We show six spaces on the plan as submitted, the five angle spaces that I mentioned and the one ADA space. I do believe that we can comply with requirements to provide the 11 spaces. We don't believe they are needed based on Hainesport Enterprises needs in terms of the office staff here. But in the interest of eliminating that variance that we provide some additional parking spaces within the frontage area. Additionally, one of the comments have to do with the angle of these parking spaces in the direct one way drive isle that's behind them, so we're going to make a modification there. Basically, your professional comments to use 30 degree angle parking, which allows for a wider one way drive out here. So that will be compliant with the ordinance eliminating the need for a design waiver.

Mr. Heinold: Speaking to the D2 variance that we applied for. So we've got a preexisting nonconforming use that is the entire operation on this site based upon the zoning along Route 38. We're changing the configuration of the building. Can you speak from a planner's perspective to the reasons as to why the proposed changes are not significant and shouldn't have a negative impact on the neighborhood?

Mr. Mancini: So as you know, this board has the ability to grant this type of D2 or expansion of a nonconforming use variance. In particular cases and for special reasons to typically demonstrate the special reasons or positive criteria by demonstrating that the

site is particularly suited to the use as proposed. In this case, particularly suited to the continued use as it was before. Stating the obvious, we think it's particularly suited because the proposed use here is exactly what it was before the fire. With the exception of reducing the footprint, it is exactly the same. As you know, the site is part of a larger complex. It's not located anywhere near existing residential uses and the proposed plan that we alluded to actually reduces some of the design conformities.

So under the existing conditions, you have building coverage that exceeded the 25% maximum about 35 before the fire by reducing the footprint of the building. It gets us down below that 25%, so we are about 23% proposed coverage now. It also reduces the nonconformity with regards to the front yard setback whereas the prior building was about 33'. It is about 33.8' to the Route 38 right of way and 58.3' to the proposed building. It is still nonconforming because we need 90' there by code but it is much less a deviation. The use variance and the request of bulk variance with regard to that front yard setback also promotes several purposes of land use law purpose i encourages a more desirable visual environment. Referenced A2. The plan that's proposed is an updated and more attractive building and more consistent with the commercial use than the prior working life. Essentially was an old firm that was converted. Purpose m speaks to coordination and land development with the view towards lessening the cost of such development and more efficient use of land. It is obvious that reusing an office here is a more efficient use of land as opposed to Hainesport Enterprises locating the office somewhere else off-site or on an adjacent parcel. We are really just redeveloping the area that's already been developed.

The negative criteria for that use variance, we have to determine whether it will result in a substantial detriment to the public good or will it substantially impair the intent or purpose of the zone planning ordinance. I don't see any substantial detriment that would arise from the use as proposed. To the contrary it reduces the nonconformity, it brings it closer to conformance with the ordinance, requirements from the bulk regulations. It provides a site that I think is better in appearance and the operation than it was before. Something like this is much less likely to cause an impact to the zone plan. Although it's not especially permitted in the HC zone, the use proposed here is compatible with neighborhood uses. In some cases it is less intense than some other communities in terms of traffic.

The final step is for the Board to weigh the positive and negative criteria and determine whether or not there would be a substantial detriment there and it would be appropriate to impose some reasonable conditions that mitigate and perceive the impacts. I believe we have done some things to mitigate those potential impacts there and some other comments from your professional's letters that we will address as well. So given the positive reasons that I stated and believe we have satisfied the criteria.

Mr. Heinold: Thank you. One of the comments that was raised was the potential need for a D1 variance if we were going to have the permanent use of pod type storage containers out on the site? Can you address that issue based upon your communications with the owner?

Mr. Mancini: In speaking with the owner, there's actually noted on our plan, temporary container to be removed or relocated. In this case it'll actually be removed so that temporary container houses files from the office and is obviously a temporary condition. Once the offices is rebuilt we'll be able to get back inside and get rid of that cbox.

Mr. Heinold: So I'll defer to the board and your professionals on a recommendation. But we will propose a condition that would require removal of the pods at some reasonable timeframe after we obtain CO on the new office space. So that we can move the contents back into the office space and then get rid of the containers. We agree that they'll be removed ultimately from the site.

Mrs. Newcomb: So on the construction end of things, many times when we have these issues, we normally will give a TCO and not a CO until pods were removed. Normally we don't go beyond 60 days. So is that something possible that the applicant would consider?

Mr. Heinold: The plan is to get in and use the space. So we will agree to that.

Mrs. Newcomb: I would like it to be in the resolution.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Could somebody just testify how long you have been in Hainesport.

Mr. Heinold: We want to ask Mr. Amendola to come up and be sworn in.

Mr. Kingsbury: Swore in Mr. Amendola

Mr. Heinold: What is your capacity with Hainesport Enterprises?

Mr. Amendola: I'm secretary and treasurer.

Mr. Heinold: How long has Hainesport Enterprises been a corporate citizen of Hainesport Township?

Mr. Amendola: Since January 22, 1988.

Mr. Krollfeifer: I know you've been an excellent resident in town and I just wanted to hear from you. Thank you.

Mr. Bradley: Sir, what exactly do you do at this facility?

Mr. Amendola: Our Company is an auto and truck repair facility. We repair vehicles, we tow vehicles, and we do bodywork. Anything that can be done to a vehicle, we can do.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Thank you, sir. Any board members have any questions?

Mr. Bradley: Can you show me how traffic gets on and off that property.

Mr. Mancini: It's a little hard to see here, but there is a depressed curb here that lines up with these overhead doors on the garage. There is another depressed curb in the front of the other building. Basically two in and out drives, one on each property. They are right in and right out.

Mr. Bradley: I thought I say a recommendation that one of those would be one way.

Mr. Mancini: So that was in reference to this isle that goes from the front of the site to the back of the site. That will be one way only so these folks that are part of an angle here would have to sort of go and circulate around. There's access out the back of the site. That is really only for employee parking. Any customers that are visiting the site go to the 1462 building which is over at the corner of Route 38 and Iowa. That is where customers are directed.

And I believe I specified folks that our customers that are visiting the site are just normal visitors. Go to the 1462. Building on the corner of 38. And that's where

Mr. Miller: When I went through the site, you can drive into the driveway area and there's storage space in the front. Temporary storage where the cars rotate through there, or how's that work?

Mr. Mancini: That is really only for folks that are working here. They temporarily move the car there and when the customer picks it up they would move it back to 1462. We want to sort of separate employee traffic, and moving in vehicles from customer traffic.

Mr. Miller: When we were looking at it, we were wondering if paint arrows on the pavement would be beneficial.

Mr. Mancini: I think so. I think that's one of the benefits revisiting the site is you can kind of clarify the circulation a little better.

Mr. Miller: Especially now, hopefully, because you will be considering more public in there than you have had. Some direction and circulation control would be better to have.

Mr. Mancini: Agreed. We can clarify with your office with signage and stripping.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Mr. Miller, I have a question for you. On the bottom of page two of your letter, dated March 30, 2022. You talk about the recommending waiver requests be denied and it carries over to the parking thing, which I believe Mr. Mancini has addressed. Is that acceptable to you?

Mr. Miller: Well, the variance that they're looking for was very minor so it's not big. It is all the employee parking.

Mr. Taylor: When we evaluated this in the application that was presented, we really only looked at the parking requirement for the reconstructed portion of the building, this whole application has really been sort of focused on that. So I think it's important that the board's action in the resolution reflect that we really only focused on that parking requirement just for this new portion of the building is 11 spaces. They're providing five, they've agreed to stripe up to 11 to eliminate that, but it really doesn't address the rest of what has been is going on in the site overall. So I think, you know, this whole application that Mr. Heinold indicated is compartmentalized just for reconstruction of that fire damage and subsequently demolished portion of the site. I want the Board to be clear. The overall parking demand if we calculated all the bays and employees would be different, but none of that is changing from what's out there today.

Mrs. Newcomb: I do have a question in regards to the sign that's on the building. Do we have an idea of the size of this sign with the present time?

Mr. Mancini: The sign is not going to be part of this application because I don't have any details for you regarding the sizes and materials or how it's going to be lit. We will come in with a design or have to come back to the board.

Mrs. Newcomb: Is this new building subject to a COA fee?

Mr. Heinold: I would just propose, typically, there's a condition that we have to comply with requirements, whatever they may be. I haven't looked at that issue. So we should probably, I don't know the answer off the top of my head. I don't know.

Mr. Kingsbury: We will have to look at the regulation. I will put it in the resolution that it's subject to COA if it's applicable. We can just determine that at a later point.

Mrs. Newcomb: I just want to bring that up. So that when you submit the building permits to my office, that's not something that comes to a question at that time.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Hopefully, we can resolve it and nothing personal, but we don't want you to come back again. Anything else?

Mr. Taylor: Just some points of clarification for Mr. Mancini. Could you confirm the building coverage or the building coverage is provided because I think there may have been a discrepancy on the plan?

Mr. Mancini: The zoning table on the plan that we submitted reflected the existing coverage minus the old office. As I mentioned in the testimony, before the building of fire raised the lot coverage of 35% minus that building which is what we put on our zoning table which erroneously reflects 21%. Really going from 35% down to 23 based on reducing that footprint.

Mr. Taylor: So, now 23.

Mr. Mancini: So 23 is correct and complies with the ordinance.

Mr. Taylor: So the application is actually for lots three and five and you mentioned there is sort of site access that happens through all those. Has any consideration being given to consolidating these lots? If that creates any kind of an economic or financial or ownership issue, I think at minimum cross access and parking easements.

Mr. Mancini: I think one or the other would be appropriate. I am not sure what one makes the most sense

Mr. Heinold: I think it makes sense and we're agreeable to just do a consolidation.

Mr. McKay: A consolidation of lots three and five.

Mr. Heinold: Yes.

Mr. Bradley: Why not all three.

Mr. Heinold: There's only two lots that are subject to the application tonight.

Mr. Kingsbury: Are you consolidating all the lots.

Mr. Heinold: We are consolidating the lots that are subject to this application, two lots.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Just three and five, correct.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Mancini: Your zoning chart reflects both three and five correct.

Mr. Mancini: That's correct.

Mr. Taylor: We have a handful of minor additional comments, do you have any issues or ability to comply with those.

Mr. Mancini: No, we will comply with those. I think there's some comments and questions regarding our technical plans. We can provide some clarity. Building titles confirmed for the record that the building height will not exceed or approach the 55' maximum for a two-story building.

Mr. Heinold: There was another note about trash and recycling on the site. You just wanted it reflected on the plan.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Well, while the subject of fire, make a note of the fact that we do have a letter from the Hainesport fire marshal. This is acceptable. It was given to us tonight. Mr. Heinold did you have a copy of it?

Mr. Heinold: We received it. Yes.

Mr. Taylor: The only other point of clarification, Mr. Chairman is technically because it's not a permitted use. This would require preliminary and final site plan approval. So they have requested and would need the board to act on that waiver of site plan. Initially, there really wasn't any site information through the technical review process with Mr. Miller. We recommended this sort of hybrid variance plan that shows the lighting, show some of these minimum improvements right around this area, which we think is satisfactory, kind of addresses this little part of the property that this is used for, but the board should evaluate and consider that as part of the motion for a waiver of site plan.

Mr. Krollfeifer: I have a question for anybody. What do we have to do to eliminate this exception? I mean, they've been here since 1988. Every time they come up because they want to do something, we have to go to a full board because it's nonconforming. What do we have to do to make it conforming?

Mr. Taylor: Well, the township could do one of two things through a reexamination report or outside of a reexamination report recommend rezoning of the property to include auto repair as a permitted use or secondarily. A redevelopment designation could also afford that same ability, where and this one is pretty unique, because there's a real aggregation of properties right in this area. So it could be done either through a redevelopment process or through a rezoning process.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Who would do that?

Mr. Taylor: The governing body would be the ones to initiate anything under the redevelopment to ask this board to do that. As part of the board's annual report back to the governing body, you could recommend some consideration be given for rezoning of this property.

Mr. Bradley: When you say this property, are you talking about all three lots.

Mr. Taylor: I was only responding to the chairman's question, because I think there's probably six or seven overall parcels in this area that are part of this larger complex. So I was talking more generative globally, generally.

Mr. Heinold: Thank you. So just for the record, we appreciate that comment, and we'd be interested in having that discussion. I think it makes a lot of sense. As we move forward. I know you don't want to see us again. We'll probably be back.

Mr. Krollfeifer: No other professional comments. I'll open it to the public for public comment. Do we have anybody online? Okay, nobody online. Nobody from the public. Okay, yes, Mrs. Kelly

Mr. Kingsbury: Swore in Leticia Kelley.

Mrs. Kelley: My name is Leticia Kelly. I live at 525 Lumberton Road, my property backs up to their property. They have been good neighbors over the years that they have been there actually, I've been there a lot longer. But it is conforming to what it was originally, when we moved in in 1975. Robert Shinn had a tractor business there. So this gentleman has expanded it over the years. He's done a very good job of putting the businesses together. I appreciate them as a neighbor. The only thing I had and I didn't bring that paper up with me. It was from Mr. Taylor's letter, and it was about the lighting. I definitely want you to encourage that strongly.

Mr. Taylor: They did agree to comply that all lighting would be full cut off fixtures and 3000 or 3500 degrees.

Mrs. Kelley: That's good. Thank you very much.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Thank you. Any other public comment? Hearing none, I'll close public comment and turn it over to the board. What's your pleasure with this application?

Mr. McKay: I motion to grant the variance for the reasons outlined by the applicants engineer, grant the waiver for preliminary and final site plan as suggested by our professionals. Subject to the following conditions: removal of the pods or the containers within 60 days after the issuance of a temporary CO, as suggested by the township official, consolidation of lots 3 and 5 into a single lot, satisfying the various conditions that have been discussed tonight that have been suggested by our professionals.

Mrs. Newcomb: May I ask a quick question regarding the consolidation of the lots. Is that something that has to be done prior to allowing the building to be built?

Mr. Kingsbury: That's something that can be done almost overnight. Mr. Heinold do you have a problem with doing that quickly?

Mr. Heinold: I'm not sure how quickly they'll be running in with a permit application. If we could have some reasonable timeframe to get that done. I'm sure we can get it done fairly quickly. I just don't know if the client is ready to basically submit the permit application as soon as we get approval.

Mr. McKay: How many months will it take to complete this building, maybe 5?

Mr. Heinold: If it was a condition to issuance of a TCO, absolutely no problem.

Mr. McKay: That's the amended motion then. Consolidation of the two lots as a condition of granting a temporary CO.

Mr. Kingsbury: Compliance with the planners and engineers letter.

Mr. McKay: Compliance with those sections of the engineers and planners letter that the applicant has agreed to.

Mr. Kingsbury: There was also a discussion about traffic arrows.

Mr. McKay: The painting of traffic arrows and other traffic movement features on the pavement. I think that covers it all.

Ms. Kosko: Should we include something about COA, affordable housing?

Mr. McKay: Well, I think our solicitor said that he would include a general requirement that it would be subject to the condition of compliance with any applicable legal requirements so that would fall under that particular condition.

Mrs. Baggio: This does not include the signage, correct?

Mr. McKay: They did not ask for the sign.

Mr. Heinold: Just to be clear if we propose signage that is permitted under the code. It would be our understanding we could come in and go right to that. If for some reason the signage is not conforming to the code, we could have to come back to you.

Mr. McKay: The sign is not part of the current application so it's irrelevant.

Mrs. Newcomb: I would suggest that the sign company whoever they choose, consult with her prior to make sure they don't have to come back to the board.

Mr. Heinold: Sounds like a plan.

Mr. McKay: That is my motion.

Second: Mrs. Tyndale

Roll call: Mr. McKay, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Mr. Murphy, yes; Mr. Bradley, yes;
Mrs. Baggio, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve.

B. Master Plan Reexamination Report Public Hearing

Mr. Krollfeifer: We're at the next order of business, which is the master plan reexamination report. This report was presented at our last meeting. And it's the guidance that we all use by Township Committee as well as the Joint Land Use Board in terms of how we're going to use our land in town. Mrs. Taylor, you want to start us off and we'll move forward from there. Do we have anybody online?

Ms. Kosko: No.

Mrs. Taylor: Well as this is the public hearing, this board is well aware what we're doing. It is the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law requires that every 10 years, the master plan and development regulations are reviewed. The way we do that is by looking at prior plans, policies of the state, county and local government, as well as population data and existing land use data. Then where there are changes recommended to the Master Plan perhaps amendments to existing plans or new elements might be completed as well as changes to the development regulations.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Does any board members have any questions about the issues that were covered at the last meeting or subsequent reading? Any questions from any of our professionals?

Mrs. Kelley: I have a comment. I did look into Lumberton Road and Lumberton Avenue situation. Evidently talking to the neighbor next door to me who is in her late 80's and has lived there since the house was pretty much built sometime in the 50s. I believe. She was saying that way back 50 some years ago it was Lumberton Avenue. She always uses Lumberton Road. I suspect because it is a county road and is a connector road from Lumberton to Route 38 that's when it became Lumberton Road. She told me she always gives her address out as Lumberton Road. In talking to one other neighbor that is closer to Route 38. She said she uses Lumberton Road, and she gives out her address, but she has had a few mailing address to Lumberton Ave. Thank you

Mr. McKay: What does Lumberton have to say about this?

Mrs. Kelley: It is a county road. The whole road goes from the North Branch of the Rancocas Creek to the southern branch to the Rancocas Creek. It's probably three, three and a half miles total and it has three names. It's Broad Street, which is where the street might come in, Lumberton Road and then Berry Avenue. That was done when the 911 was put in.

Mrs. Taylor: So, for the record, we'll call it Lumberton Road.

Mrs. Kelley: That is fine with me.

Mrs. Newcomb: The items that we discussed in regards to my zoning items, fencing and some of the other things, is that something that is in this paperwork still?

Mrs. Taylor: Yes, it is, hasn't been stricken. I guess we could talk about the highway commercial zone and auto vehicle repair at some point. That's up to you.

Mrs. Newcomb: I don't think you all want to talk about anything that was going to be taken out. And I appreciate you working with me in regards to trying to get some of those issues resolved.

Mrs. Taylor: That's part of the whole job to do this.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Okay, if there are no other questions from anybody on the board or professionals, I'll turn it over to public comment.

Mr. McKay: I believe the record should reflect that there is no one online. In the audience, there is one person sitting in the back row. So nobody from the public has come in to make any comments.

Mr. Krollfeifer: So I will now close public comment. Ask for a motion on the action that the board wishes to take relative to the master plan presentation to the Township Committee.

Ms. Kosko motioned to accept the Master Plan.

Second: Mrs. Kelley

Roll call: Ms. Kosko, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mrs. Gilmore, yes; Mr. Bradley, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Mr. Murphy, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve.

7. Minutes

A. Meeting minutes of the March 3, 2022 regular & executive meetings

Motion to approve: Mr. Bradley

Second: Mrs. Baggio

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

Motion carries to approve.

8. Resolutions - None

9. Correspondence

A. Certification dated February 17, 2022 from Burlington Co Soil Conservation to Mr. Blair

Re: Block 100 Lots 8.03 & PO 8.02

B. Letter dated March 2, 2022 from Langan Engineering to the Board

Re: Response to comments from Alaimo Assoc. letter, 710 Marne Highway

C. Letter dated March 2, 2022 from Langan Engineering to the Board

Re: Response to comments from Taylor Design letter, 710 Marne Highway

D. Hainesport Township Resolution 2022-50-3 approving performance bond reduction

For Hainesport Commerce Center Urban Renewal, LLC

E. Letter dated March 9, 2022 from Taylor Design to the Board

Re: Bluewater Property Group LLC., Block 24 Lots 4.01, 11, 12.01, 12.02, 12.03, 12.04, 12.05, 710 Marne Highway, Resolution compliance signoff

F. Certification (part of) dated March 11, 2022 from Burlington Co Soil Conservation to Mr. Blair

Re: Block 24 Lots various, 710 Marne Highway

G. Letter dated March 24, 2022 from Alaimo Engineering to Board
 Re: Bluewater Property Group, LLC., proposed warehouse, Block 24 Lots 4.01, 11,
 12.01, 12.02, 12.03, 12.04, 12.05, 710 Marne Highway, Compliance review #2

Motion to accept and file: Mrs. Gilmore

Second: Mrs. Kelley

Roll call: Mrs. Gilmore, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mr. Bradley, yes;
 Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Murphy, yes;
 Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries.

10. Professional Comments

Mrs. Newcomb: I would just like to put on record that it was a pleasure dealing with Mrs. Taylor and our group during our plan review for the redevelopment of the town and some of the issues that have been outstanding. In the 19 and a half years that I've been here, some of them were addressed, and are approved now, to make things easier for residents and your zoning official. In the sense is that they've been outstanding for a very long time. Our meetings that we had on Wednesday night really came to fruition, and Mrs. Taylor has done an excellent job in getting that together.

Mrs. Taylor: Thank you.

Mr. Krollfeifer: It was mentioned at the last meeting, to list all the names of the township people who volunteered to help us with it.

Mrs. Newcomb: Yes, our residents were wonderful during that time

Ms. Kosko: Their names would be will be in the document.

Mrs. Taylor: So the document will be amended so that there will be a summary of all your recommendations, the recommendations will be consolidated, the names of the subcommittee will be added, dates, and signed. We will get it in a format in electronically and physically copies. You can tell me how many. We'll talk tomorrow about copies and all that sort of thing.

Mr. McKay: Does that get the final document in electronic form get posted as a township document so anybody can go online and find it.

Ms. Kosko: Yes. They are all online now under the Land Use Board.

Mr. Krollfeifer: It has been on there as a draft for a month easily. Any other comments from the professionals? Any Board comments.

11. Board Comments

Ms. Kosko: I just want to echo Mrs. Newcomb. It was awesome to work with you and it was a great experience.

Mrs. Taylor: It was a pleasure working with all of you.

Ms. Kosko: It was great. You did a wonderful job corralling everyone and keeping us on task. When you're dealing with different personalities it can be a challenge. You've mastered it. We thank you for all your work on.

12. Public Comments - None

13. Adjournment

Mrs. Gilmore motioned to adjourn at 7:55pm

Second: Mrs. Baggio

Roll call: All in favor.

Paula L Tiver, Secretary