

**HAINESPORT TOWNSHIP JOINT LAND USE BOARD  
MINUTES**

**Time: 7PM**

**November 2, 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: Mayor MacLachlan, Mr. McKay, Mrs. Kelley, Mrs. Gilmore,  
Mr. Tricocci, Mrs. Tyndale, Mrs. Baggio, Ms. Kosko, Mr. Bradley,  
Mr. Noworyta, Mr. Krollfeifer

Absent: Mr. Murphy

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 19-09C: R & M Development, LLC  
Block 100 Lots 8.03, 8.02  
60 Bancroft Lane  
Revised Subdivision, Preliminary/Final Subdivision Approval  
Attorney: David C. Frank**

Mr. Frank requested by email dated November 2, 2022 that the application be carried to the December 7, 2022 meeting. New public notice is required.

Mrs. Tyndale motioned to carry to December 7, 2022.

Second: Mrs. Baggio

**Roll call:** Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mayor MacLachlan, yes;  
Mr. McKay, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mrs. Gilmore, yes; Mr. Tricocci, yes;

Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes  
Motion carries.

**B. Case 18-04B: Longbridge Farms, LLC**  
**Block 103.01 Lots 1 & 8 and Block 113 Lot 4.05**  
**Route 38 & Mt. Laurel Road**  
**Preliminary Major Subdivision**  
**Attorney: Douglas Heinold, Charles Petrone**

Charles Petrone: I am filling in for Doug Heinold. Just a quick introduction as most of you are aware property in front of you tonight is Longbridge Farms track that recently had a redevelopment plan, applied to it. This evening we are seeking preliminary approval for the development which will consist of townhouse lots, under fee simple form of ownership, four single family, and detached residential dwelling lots. We're going to establish the commercial model as part of the subdivision for future development. We're just establishing the lot we're not here for seeking any type of approval with respect to the commercial lot other than creating a lot, as well as a couple of open space lots.

We will be establishing the homeowner's association with respect to the townhouse community with certain restrictions and limitations as well as responsibility for the stormwater management basins. Contributions for the stormwater management basins will be provided by not only the townhouse units but also the four fee-simple single-family dwellings will also be contributing towards the maintenance of the basins.

With me this evening, I have Rick Clemson the applicants professional engineer, Drew Krisanda and Eric Ravikio, representatives of the applicant. Jason McNee of Ryan Homes, the ultimate builder of the townhouse structures and we have a Dave Shropshire from Shropshire Associates, a traffic engineer. I don't anticipate calling everyone, some of them are just here in case there's a question that comes up that their testimony is needed. I'm going to have them sworn in.

Mr. Kingsbury: Swore in all the witnesses.

Mr. Petrone: I will have the witnesses identify themselves and their representation as they are called. Okay. First witnesses requested if you can just provide your qualifications.

Rick Clemson: Gave his qualifications:

Mr. Krollfeifer: Any objections? If not, acceptable.

Mr. Clemson: We are going to start with exhibit A1, an aerial photograph that shows the boundary of the track in relation to other land uses they are around the site. The purpose of the application is to subdivide the Longbridge Farm track into 45 fee simple townhouses, three new single-family lots, one single family lot remains, two open space lots and one 11.6 acre commercial lot that will be set aside for future application. I'll get into more detail and move along. I just wanted to get that on the record.

The overall track for Longbridge Farm consists Block 103.01 Lots 1, & 8. One is the largest of the three properties that is in the northern portion of the track. Eight which is a small block. Block 113 Lot 4.05 lot is to the left side is in the southwest border upper

track. Lots 8 and 4.05 both have frontage on Mt. Laurel Road. The largest property lot one has frontage. We have frontage on Mt. Laurel Road, Fostertown Road and Route 38. Mt. Laurel Road and Fostertown Road are county roads and Route 38 is a state highway. To the north of the site, we have a mix of commercial and residential. This area immediately to the north from outside of Route 38 is a residential subdivision. There is Mason's Creek. We have commercial and this is a vacant car dealership, there are a few single-family homes along Mt. Laurel Road to the south of the site we have primarily residential. The Hainesport Chase subdivision is to the south of us and to the north and east of us we have a series of large lot single family lots that are not part of any specific subdivision.

The existing track consists of a single-family home which is now situated on lot 4.05. In addition to the single-family home, we have a wooded wetlands here but primarily the site has historically been used for agriculture. The track known as Longbridge was part of the Redevelopment Plan that was adopted in July of 2021.

I'm going to switch to A2, which is also an aerial photograph but overlay on top of the photographs we have a layout of the project. I am going to have a total of 4 exhibits tonight. The Longbridge Redevelopment Plan created two new zones of the Redevelopment area townhouse district which is this area here. We will call it central to the site which is the townhouse area. The portion of the property that has frontage on Route 38 and Fostertown Road is the commercial district that was established by the redevelopment plan. We also have a portion of land that fronts on Mt. Laurel Road that retained an R1 designation. That is where we had proposed three new single-family houses and retaining one existing single-family home.

The townhouse area district standards have established some bulk standards and some permitted uses. So, the permitted uses are townhouses. There are 45 townhouses proposed. We have complied with the redevelopment plan. It requires a minimum track area of 10.9 acres. It has a maximum density of 4-1/2. The plan requires a numerous amount of bulk standards such as lot area, front setbacks, give the normal bulk standards. We have complied with all of those standards. They are not asking for any variances related to the townhouse area.

In the R1 area which is where we had the four single-family homes along Mt Laurel Road. We have the standards listed in the ordinance section 104-46. We comply with all the bulk standards in the R1 zone. We are asking for two design waivers associated with the single-family area. There is a design requirement that the single-family houses along Mt. Laurel Road are setback 75' from the right of way. That standard is met on three of the lots. The design waiver applies to lot 2. So, we have the house situated at 65.6 feet from the ultimate right of way of Mt. Laurel Road where 75' is recommended in the design standards. We respectfully ask for that waiver because setting the house at that location, it affords the most usable rear yard area of the lot as well as distributing the yard areas around the house most efficiently.

We would also note that there are a number of other houses already along Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road that kind of conform to that design requirement. We would not be along being slightly less than 75 feet.

Mr. Petrone: Has that also been designed with the driveway not from the county road but from the new road being proposed.

Mr. Clemson: Another interesting fact regarding this particular lot, lot 2. That lot does not actually have a driveway connection to the county road. The driveway accessing lot 2 will come from our local streets, the main road known as Road A. That is another reason why we would ask for that design waiver. We only have two of the four lots that actually have driveway access to the county road which the county required.

We are 65 ½ feet plus or minus as well for the ultimate right of way but the county did take 17 feet of additional right away from the land. So, this the house in terms of how it's situated to the road will be 95 feet from the widened portion of Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. We will be 95 feet from the actual curb line. So, the house will still setback very far.

The second design waiver we had basically relates to all four of the single-family homes. I'm going to skip over A3 and go directly to A4. It is a color rendering. This is a blow up so the board could see better. The second waiver relates to a buffer restriction along Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. So, we provide a 25' buffer restriction along the frontage, we can restrict installing any kind of structures within that area. That component of that buffer that we're actually seeking relief from is the landscape buffer portion of that requirement. We do propose landscaping along the county road. For instance, on lot one there are 4 street trees, 3 ornamental trees, and there are some shrubs and similarly on lot 2, 50, and 51. We also have street trees, ornamental trees, and shrubs to supplement those trees that we feel provides a visual buffer to the county road without creating a screen. We respectively ask the Board and we're willing to work with the planner to allow us the ability to adhere to that requirement as best as we can without creating a wall. So, leaving the house completely visible from the street. There is one home on the road that has shrubs installed in front of the house and is not visible from the street. He does not believe that is the intention of the design requirement.

We are proposing 45 fee simple townhouses within the townhouse zone which is created by the redevelopment plan. Townhouse lots will be 2,200 sq. ft. or larger, 20' wide, a minimum of 110' deep and will be compliant with the townhouse zoning standards for this redevelopment area. The project is serviced by two public streets, Road A and Road B. Those streets are 50' wide, 30' wide cartway. They are consistent with the residential neighborhood streets and are in line with the RSIS. The roads are curbed with sidewalks on both sides and were designed in accordance with the RSIS. The primary access is Road A and has a direct connection to Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. It is directly opposite of Easton Way. Road B ties directly into Road A. Trash and recycling are proposed for curbside pickup.

We did receive preliminary subdivision approval from the county. They are required to widen Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road a width of 20' from the centerline. Curbing and sidewalk is proposed along the entire frontage, the additional 17' right of way giving a total of 50'. Two of the single-family homes, lot 2 and lot 51, have been designed to access Road A. It is a requirement of the county. The other two on the extremes of the North and Southern ends would have access directly to the county road. All the townhouses will have access to either Road A or B. The townhouses will have a single car garage and a 10' wide driveway.

The parking that we have proposed is in accordance with the RSIS. It requires 2 ½ parking spaces for each four bedroom single-family home and 2.4 spaces for each of our townhouses. The result is a total of 118 parking spaces required. Ten for the single-

family homes and 108 for the townhouses. Each of the single-family homes has a two car garage, and two car driveway. Therefore, provides three and a half spaces per home. Each of the proposed townhouse units has a one car garage and driveway combination. It provides two parking spaces per unit for a total of 90 spaces. The road design also provides for 25 common area parking spaces. We have them on Road B and also at the end of Road A. We also have 7 on street spaces available for parallel parking identified on the site plane. The combination of the 32 common parking spaces/parallel spaces and the home spaces provides a total of 122 spaces for the townhouse area exceeds the amount required.

Mr. Petrone: There was a question regarding whether or not the parallel spaces on the road were going to be striped.

Mr. Clemson: The parallel spaces are identified on our site plan so they can be seen and verified. It is not our intent to stripe the parallel parking spaces. It is unusual to do that in a residential setting. If the Board decides they want them, they can certainly mark them.

We do have passive recreation proposed. It is at the intersection of Roads A & B in a portion of open space lot 41. It consists of a gazebo, a walkway, some benches, and a picnic table as requested by the planner.

The planner and engineer's letter both talked about electric vehicle spaces. Based on our prior subdivision experiences, due to the fee simple nature of the development, the lots are all owned by whoever buys them. The land is with the building. It is not a condominium or any other type design where the folks own the houses and not the land. Every home and townhouse have a garage with electrical service available. As a result, we don't; feel the EVO rules would require a pedestal type provision in a common parking area here. That service is available basically with any house.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Let's assume for a second that I'm living in one of those and I have company come pay me a visit. There's adequate parking at the end of that road A as you indicated. Suppose the person that comes to visit me came from 300 miles away in an electric vehicle and has to charge. They're going to have to go to my garage and do it.

Mr. Clemson: Yes, or they would have to go to the nearest station.

Mr. Krollfeifer: I thought I read something that these properties are required to make arrangements for me. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. Taylor: Just to clarify, and the applicant has a different interpretation of the law. In hundreds of other units, perhaps a couple thousand units since the laws come out. The law is very specific that almost all multifamily or multiple dwellings provide for EV charging. There's a specific implementation schedule and it only exempts out three exceptions, retailers who provide less than 25 spaces, one family and two-family homes. It is our opinion is that every single one of these units is subject to that requirement, only 15% of them have to have the charging equipment installed. The law has a schedule that says 1/3 of those must be installed in year one. At the time of construction, the next 30 needs to be at year three, the next eight years. The Board does not have the authority to waive that law. If the applicant has a difference of opinion, my suggestion would be the of interior garage. The second is whether the common parking also needs an EV charger.

I am not 100% certain. Our recommendation would be that it the Board consider any approval of the application, make it a condition that they comply with the New Jersey EV charging law. Between the applicant and us we can get determination from Maria Connolly at DCA. But exactly whether or not townhouse units have to provide the recharging. I don't think either party really has any alternative. We can't wait, like the accessible parking. We can't say what the law requires five, but you can just put 4 on your site. I think they have to comply with whatever DCA says is what it's going to be.

Mr. Petrone: Mr. Taylor just gave my summary. We obviously have a difference of opinion. I was going to propose we work it out with the boards professional. We are only seeking preliminary approval so you will see us again. I was also going to further if we can't come to an understanding with the board's professionals, we will seek interpretation from the Department of Community Affairs regarding of this project prior to final. So, that won't be an issue.

Mr. McKay: What is the approximate cost for one these outdoor EV charging stations.

Mr. Petrone: That would just be pure speculation on our part.

Mr. McKay: I don't believe that, you've looked at this stuff.

Mr. Clemson: I actual do not know. Power is made available in the garages. That's very simple. To be honest. You don't need a charging station or a pedestal or anything special like that. We specialize enough to provide charging capabilities to an EV just like you would want a high voltage outlet available so a 220 outlet is available to do the charge. Then if you do that then it's essentially plug and play.

Mr. McKay: Are you making the 220 outlets? It's like a dryer outlet, correct?

Mr. Clemson: Correct.

Mr. McKay: Are you making the 220 outlets in each garage available either as a standard feature or as an extra.

Mr. Clemson: An extra.

Mr. MacLachlan: So, as this electric vehicle thing rolls out, I go to visit a friend. I'm plugging my car into his house and I'm taking his electricity to go home. I know, I looked for electric vehicles in my own business and I think it's 13 or 15 bucks to charge a vehicle. I can understand the law. It's a good it's it makes sense. You don't know how far the electric vehicle thing is going to catch on but it sure looks strong right now. I guess when you plug in, it knows who you are on a public place and bills your account. So, I can see it makes sense. So, I'm in agreement with Mr. Taylor, whatever the DCA says you need to do.

Mr. Petrone: We're in agreement with that.

Mr. Clemson: The US Postal Service has changed the policy over the last three years. They not longer deliver mail to homes like these. It gets delivered to cluster boxes. We have proposed 2 cluster boxes. One is located at the end of the parking on Road B and the other is adjacent to the parking area at the end of Road A. We will be submitting our

plans to the postmaster for approval and comments. If they want them moved, it will be shown on the final plan.

The planner had noted that we had some notes on the detail that are not relevant to this project so they will be removed.

Mr. McKay: Let me go back to the intersection of Road A and Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. The widening that you described that the county wants, is the decel lane going to be striped for entry into Road A? Similar to what's on the other side of the road.

Mr. Clemson: The edge line will be striped. It will be at 12' from the centerline. The paved area beyond that would be technically a shoulder that is available for vehicles to slow down. As part of the design that was already improved by the county.

Mr. McKay: On the other side of the road coming into Hainesport Chase heading into Hainesport, there is a striped decel lane.

Mr. Clemson: We will have the edge line but no arrows identifying it as a decel lane. That is a very old design.

Mr. Krollfeifer: The decel lane we are talking about is not old. It was done maybe four or five years ago.

Mr. Clemson: The line does provide for the ability of a vehicle on the shoulder to slow down prior to entering Road A. It is fully vetted by the county.

Mr. McKay: What is the road that is going to be right at the intersection. I'm thinking in terms of cars queuing up to make a left-hand turn into Hainesport Chase.

Mr. Clemson: You will be able to go around them because our lining has gone the entire frontage. So, we'll be striping at 12' and 8 so you would be able to go around.

We have also provided a total of 7 bike racks scattered through the site, a requirement of the redevelopment plan. One for each townhouse building. They are not directly in front of the building.

Moving on to stormwater. The Longbridge subdivision has been designed according to the latest stormwater rules, including the infrastructure and best management practices which was adopted in 2021. So, in general this requires small-scale basins to be placed throughout the site as compared to having one or two large facilities. Based on the new standards resulting in a larger number of basins to be constructed. The small-scale structures are scattered through the site that is close to the source of the runoff. There are 8 small scale basins and one large scale basin. The one large scale basin is all the way to the northern end of site, not far from Route 38. We have a smaller system here so lot one lot 2 behind lot 15. This opens space area here adjacent to lot 48. We have a series of three rain gardens behind building four and five along Road A. What this does is creates this treatment drain approach where you have water in one facility, then in another, and then in another. Ultimately it makes its way there to the large-scale system. So, the small-scale facilities are designed specifically to treat stormwater close to the source. Whereas, the large-scale facility is primarily for stormwater quantity control. To bring infrastructure rules, limit the types of facilities that can be utilized for both small and

large-scale systems. In the Longbridge subdivision each of the facilities, small-scale and large-scale, were all detention basins. These basins will be planted in the bottom with 18" of a planting soil and plantings of grasses and shrubs throughout the bottom area. They clean the water before it ends up in the large basin.

Mr. McKay: What kind of maintenance do they require?

Mr. Clemson: It will require similar to any landscape area: occasional pruning and weeding,

Mr. McKay: Is that projected to be the responsibility of the HOA?

Mr. Clemson: Yes. The single family are part of the HOA.

Mr. McKay: As part of the HOA documents, are you giving maintenance instructions to the HOA.

Mr. Clemson: Absolutely.

Mr. Petrone: We submitted a maintenance plan. I believe one of Mr. Miller's comments requires some tweaking of the maintenance plan. But the maintenance plan will be incorporated into the HOA documents. I believe the declaration will have to be recorded at the County Clerk's Office referencing the maintenance plan so the HOA will have ample knowledge of their responsibilities.

Mr. McKay: Are these drainage areas to be fenced or unfenced?

Mr. Clemson: Unfenced. All of these small facilities are 24" or less, they are shallow. They do actually provide some rain control but primarily there for following treatments.

Mr. McKay: The main area of drainage fronting on Route 38, looks to be maybe be an acre.

Mr. Clemson: The larger basin is probably around 30 to 40,000 sq. feet.

Mr. McKay: Is it treated similarly to the smaller basins or slightly different?

Mr. Clemson: The large-scale facility even though technically it is serving a different purpose, will be constructed the same way. It will be deeper and does not have that 24" limitation.

Mr. McKay: So, it will not look quite like the basin across the street in Hainesport Chase.

Mr. Clemson: If you go back twenty years, they had grass bottom one of the previous iterations of the NJ stormwater rules have a sand bottom infiltration basin. You can still do the same basins. You would have to have the right kind of soil to do that. The other option highly recommended is bio retention.

Mr. McKay: Is the large basin bordering Route 38 intended in the future to service that commercial development potentially going to the west?

Mr. Clemson: Yes.

Mr. McKay: So, its size for some hypothetical commercial.

Mr. Clemson: We are in accordance with the redevelopment plan. Essentially 33% of that basin is dedicated to commercial use.

Mr. McKay: I see a tree line in the distance on Route 38. Is that a sort of buffer space.

Mr. Clemson: Yes, they are buffer plantings there and there are proposed plantings.

Mrs. Kelley: Which is really the back of the commercial.

Mr. Clemson: Yes. This would be like the far eastern end of the commercial area. Exhibit A3 is a color rendering with this particular plan. We changed the scale of the plan so that you can see the limits of the entire property as well as all the surrounding lots.

Mr. McKay: The wetlands area that is designated on this A3 in like a green bubble there.

Mr. Clemson: This is that green finger that jets out into the property.

Mr. McKay: Who will have title to that?

Mr. Clemson: That will be part of the HOA.

Mr. McKay: So, it's going to be in the HOA for this development.

Mr. Clemson: There's a portion the way the division line is situated right now in order to maximize that commercial area. I realize me moving a laser pointer around the property kind of hard to describe. Basically, this significant area of the property is all the commercial area. So, what I would say to that question is the majority of the wetland is in the townhouse zones and within the limits of the lands that will be maintained by the townhouses there is a small piece of it which will extend out into the commercial area.

Mr. McKay: What is the plan to do with that?

Mr. Clemson: It is to be left alone. There is not a lot of maintenance involved. You probably could have some sort of insurance policy. It is not much. The commercial area will be responsible for that tip there.

Mr. McKay: On the same point you just made with respect to the big retention basin, because it's a long Route 38. You always have the prospect of junk garbage, trash, whatever coming off Route 38. Who throws this stuff out the window, but they do. The HOA will have responsibility to keep that clean.

Mr. Clemson: Correct.

Mr. Krollfeifer: I'm confused about that larger basin. Isn't that on the commercial property?

Mr. Clemson: It is. That is the way the redevelopment plan was approved; a portion of the basin is set aside for the townhouses and a portion of it was set aside for the commercial. The plan that we are looking at here tonight is a portion according to the redevelopment plan.

Mr. McKay: Who is going to own the basin?

Mr. Clemson: In a case like this where you would have runoff from a residential use and a commercial use once would take the lead. Say the HOA takes the lead on all the maintenance, HOA will come first so they would take the lead on the basin. When the commercial area is developed, and they start to direct runoff into the basin. We're going to build it to its full potential according to the redevelopment plan. But it won't really receive any runoff from the commercial area till its developed. When the that happens and receives a runoff than the usual way it works is there is an operating agreement which would be put into effect. That would balance out the financial percentage of two entities that are draining into the same facility. For instance, if the residential area is 50 to 66 percent and the commercial is 33 percent, then the cost of the maintenance would be prorated the same way.

Mr. McKay: Taxes and maintenance?

Mr. Clemson: All costs associated with the basin.

Mr. McKay: Is there an emergency overflow from that large basin.

Mr. Clemson: Yes. The emergency overflow is towards the wetland area. Remember that is an emergency overflow. This basin is designed to control the 100-year storm. Everyone of these facilities has an emergency overflow.

Mr. McKay: You're not worried about the wooded area becoming flooded impacting back onto the townhouses and single-family homes that border it.

Mr. Clemson: The way the stormwater management system was designed, we made painstaking efforts to redirect stormwater away from the wetlands and the associated pitch down to Fostertown Road and redirect that water towards the storm sewer system in Route 38. We will be reducing the amount of water that would go into that wetland area, substantially. Most of the property drains into there. We have made an effort to avoid water going into that area. I don't have any concerns about it.

Mr. Petrone: An additional comment with respect to the stormwater since I know it was in Mr. Miller's letter. We do require DOT approval to tie in and we'll do that subsequent to any approval that the Board may grant.

Mr. Clemson: We do need DOT approval and drainage from them.

Mr. McKay: So, you will also tie into the highway department, stormwater runoff, on Route 38. I guess that goes down towards the creek.

Mr. Clemson: It goes down to a low point on Route 38, to the west of Fostertown Road, it wraps around to the north end and eventually makes its way to Mason's Creek. All we're doing is taking it from here and pushing it out to Route 38.

Mr. McKay: You're taking the treat of overflow to the adjacent property.

Mr. Petrone: The DEP permit that you referenced in your testimony is for stormwater purposes.

Mr. Clemson: No, it's for buffer.

Mr. Petrone: But we do have an LOI for the wetlands. So, we do not have to worry about the wetlands changing. Subsequent to any approval that this board may grant will apply to the DEP for buffer averaging permit. That just has to do with the distance from the edge of the wetland areas to development areas.

Mr. Clemens: Correct.

Mr. Taylor: I would like to clarify two things for the record. I don't want to say townhouse HOA because four single families are included. The single families and townhouses are responsible to maintain the basin.

Mr. Petrone: Correct.

Mr. Taylor: Whether or not they get reimbursed or whatever deal they have with the commercial is a separate entity. So that if there is ever an issue the contact is the HOA.

Mr. Petron: Correct.

Mr. Taylor: Secondly, I don't think any of the plantings in the large basin were shown.

Mr. Clemson: Absolutely, we will add.

Mr. McKay: Can you just give us a sort of picture of what the large basin would look like. A forest field at the end of the day when things grow up?

Mr. Clemson: Well, I wouldn't call it a forest. I would compare it to a meadow. It is going to be more low growing shrubs, grasses, and water tolerant plants.

Mr. McKay: I'm sure it is designed to keep maintenance at a reasonable level. You don't want to overburden the HOA.

Mr. Clemson: Correct.

Mrs. Kelley: So, This Homeowners Association is not only including new development, including the old existing homes?

Mr. Clemson: There is only one existing home.

Moving on to landscaping. As you can see from this exhibit A4, that landscaping has been provided throughout the subdivision. Street trees have been provided all along Roads A and B, at 40' intervals. Dense buffering has been provided along the southernly and westerly border with adjacent single-family homes. We have buffering between the single-family homes and the townhouse area. We also have the next buffer that separates

from back, of the townhouses from the adjacent lot. We have buffering between the large-scale basin and Route 38. Landscaping around the rec area. There is quite a bit of landscaping. Not including vegetation going in the rain garden, bio retention. We are looking at 84 trees, 48 ornamental trees, 256 evergreen trees, and 228 shrubs.

Mr. McKay: What kind of street trees are you using?

Mr. Clemson: We have red maple, ginkgo, black gum, pin oak.

Mr. McKay: You're putting in ginkgo?

Mr. Clemson: They would have to put in one sex.

Mr. McKay: Male only. How do you prevent the random female in the next yard pollinating? Ginkgo may not be such a good idea.

Mr. Clemson: We are willing to entertain any options. It is not a problem.

Mr. McKay: I always asked about street trees because in the past there were hybrids that aren't very good trees. They don't last long or don't look very good after a few years. Everything sounds ok except the ginkgo.

Mrs. Baggio: All the plants and shrubs will be part of the HOA and paid for by them?

Mr. Clemson: Yes. The street trees would be the responsibility of each landowner because they are fee simple lots. Any vegetation associated with buffers, basins, and anything like that would be the responsibility of the HOA.

Mr. Bradley: All common area and shrubs will be the HOA?

Mr. Clemson: Correct.

Mr. Petrone: Having experienced Mr. Taylor's comments on landscaping in other municipalities, this point is well taken care of.

Mr. Taylor: Just a follow up. If the street trees will not be the responsibility of the HOA and are to be the responsibility of the individual homeowners, then it needs to be reflected in the HOA documents and we have some other comments about HOA documents.

Mr. Petrone: Obviously as a condition of any approval it's going to require us to submit HOA documents for the review and approval of the board professionals. We have no problems whatsoever with that as a standard condition.

Mr. McKay: Which side of the sidewalk are you planting the trees?

Mr. Clemson: Between curb and sidewalk.

Mr. McKay: That sounds like it is in the right of way and you will still have the homeowner responsible for that?

Mr. Clemson: Yes.

Mr. MacLachlan: Are we sure we want to do that we're just cleaning up a big mess on Craig Drive. I'm not sure I like that.

Mr. McKay: We can put them on the other side of the sidewalk.

Mr. Taylor: It's a double-edged sword. If you want to put them on the back side of the sidewalk, the applicant would need to provide a street tree planting easement in that area and then it would depend on the disposition of who's responsible for maintaining those, whether it is the HOA or the homeowner. This is something that we need to get worked out. They are only here for preliminary approval this evening. They will have to come back to the board for final approval. That is an issue that gets worked out.

Mr. MacLachlan: I really don't remember planting trees between curb and sidewalk since I have been on the planning board.

Mr. Taylor: Most ordinances do require them between the curb and sidewalk.

Mr. Petrone: We can resolve this issue. We have no problem moving the trees.

Mr. McKay: Maple tree roots do a job on sidewalks.

Mr. Clemson: The last thing is lighting. The redevelopment plan did outline standards. The lighting we are proposing is decorative lighting, LED luminaries pole mounted and they are distributed through the subdivision. The lights are full cutoff lights which are lights that prevent top lighting towards the sky. The legs are going to be on decorative poles mounted at 16' height, will have 3,000 Kelvin color associated with them. They will have a warmer color.

Mr. Petrone: Is there a development sign proposed with the preliminary application?

Mr. Clemson: No, deferred to final.

Mr. Petrone: One of Mr. Taylor's comments was with respect to a sidewalk connection between the residential side and commercial side. Describe why we want to defer the sidewalk connection.

Mr. Clemson: At the end of Road A is where the effective commercial area. We would show a sidewall connector. It would take this through the boundary line. We would probably ask however the sidewalk installation be deferred until the commercial is actually developed. We don't want to have a walkway in and then have to tear it out to move it. No objections in providing the walkway and graphically show it on the plans so that everyone know it is a requirement but simply defer its installation so we know where it is going.

Mr. McKay: Makes sense.

Mr. Taylor: Who builds it on your property?

Mr. Clemson: The Longbridge applicant will take that responsibility once we know where that is suppose to go.

Mr. Taylor: The problem with that is if it is 3 or 8 years before the commercial is built, the bonding the HOA townhouse development is completely gone. We are talking about 9 feet of sidewalk. I would go with the nine feet and if the commercial doesn't connect at that spot its easier.

Mr. Clemson: They will do it.

Mr. MacLachlan: How are two people going to be responsible for the storm basin.

Mr. Taylor: There will be one. That's why I asked the question. There will be a condition of this approval, that the townhouses and residential are responsible for the maintenance of that basin in perpetuity so whether a little or big commercial site gets built or not, the township's direct contact is the HOA. If any thing goes south between the HOA and the commercial, are contact is still the HOA.

A discussion occurred on possible different scenarios.

Mr. Taylor: Will look into it further.

Mr. Miller: There is going to have to be an agreement between the homeowner's association and commercial. It is effectively owned by the HOA. The commercial property, it is to their benefit to come to some agreement. If they don't come to some agreement and they can't use the basin, they will have to provide it on their own property which will be a big loss to them. They have a real incentive to come to some king of agreement.

Mr. Kingsbury: There will be insurance on it. It is a requirement that it is in the HOA documents. The township should be listed as a second coverage on the insurance policy. The insurance company would be notified if there is any cancellation of the insurance policy.

Mr. Taylor: The basin is technically on the commercial lot so it will be the property of the commercial lot but the residential HOA is obligated to maintain it.

Mr. Petrone: Have you satisfactory addressed all Mr. Miller's comments and will be able to provide him the details and revisions to the plans that he's requesting.

Mr. Clemson: I have reviewed and have no objections.

Mr. Petrone: You communicated with someone from Mr. Miller's office today regarding the stormwater comments that were and under the stormwater comments that are in Mr. Miller's letter are problematic to the operations of the stormwater system as designed.

Mr. Miller: I agree with that. We do not know what DOT is going to ask. They may have a comment that there is less water getting into the wetlands area.

Mr. Petrone: Understood. Between now and final some of those comments will be able to be addressed. That is all the questions I have for Mr. Clemson unless the Board has any.

Dave Shropshire: They did the initial traffic study and then actually we did a supplement. This site is going to generate between 40 to 45 peak hour trips. That is less than half the traffic you can see coming in and out of Easton Way. The four-way intersection, everything will function at a level service C or better. Mr. Clemson has described the county, specifically required widening along Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road in order to provide the ability to bypass left turning traffic. We followed what the county was requiring. Again, level service C or better for car traffic coming out, very low impact. Left hand turn movements in the range of six to eleven. It is not a big generator therefore there wasn't a substantial impact and we have county approval with regards to the access drive.

Mr. Petrone; Basically, the county required improvements are predicated on the numbers. Mr. Krollfeifer: Is it contemplated to be a traffic signal at that intersection or the next one down at Fostertown Road?

Mr. Shropshire: Not that I am aware of. This doesn't add to the level of traffic that would warrant the traffic signal. I'm not sure at Fostertown Road.

Mr. Krollfeifer: It is the one with the red blinker because I know that traffic backs up a little before Easton Way going towards Wawa in the southbound lane. Can someone explain that at the intersection of Road A, Road B, Easton Way, and Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road, how many lanes are going to be there? It sounds like there is going to be a couple left hand turn lanes.

Mr. Shropshire: No. The way it is being designed is there will only be one true lane in each direction. There is an existing deceleration lane right turn lane. Which is somewhat an older design. However, I believe the county is trying to get enough width on the roadway and enough pavement so they might be able to do some improvement overall in the future. That is why the right of way is so big. We are doing the widening on our side so that we can get enough width so additional improvements might be done in the future. In effect, it's one lane on each side coming into and out of that intersection with sufficient shoulders for bypass traffic.

Mr. Petrone: Basically, the county is banking land for future improvements.

Mr. Krollfeifer: You said that there would only be 40 to 45 during peak hours but some number that we heard before were getting up close to 100.

Mr. Shropshire: Easton Way pm peak is 99 access combined in and out and our number obviously is 45, which is less than half.

Mr. Krollfeifer: I guess the county has approved the additional two curb cuts for the residential part.

Mr. Shropshire. Yes, and that those two lots go into Road A.

Mrs. Kelley: I imagine if you have a school bus turn into Easton Way before it picks up any children. Are you anticipating that the children will be picked up right at Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road or are you anticipating the bus going in.

Mr. Shropshire: I don't know the specifics of how the Board of Education will do the bus route. It would be consistent with the county plan to have that bus stop at the county road rather than go interior into the development.

Mr. McKay: School buses go into Hainesport Chase.

Mr. Shropshire: It would depend on the volume of children and places to turn around within the development. It may make sense to come out to the county road. The Board of Education will determine that.

Mr. McKay: I believe your cul-da-sac is big enough to have a fire truck.

Mr. Shropshire: Yes.

Mrs. Baggio: Are Roads A and B public roads?

Mr. Petrone: Yes.

Mrs. Newcomb: Do the two driveways that are on Mt. Laurel Road, have the ability to turn around on their own property?

Mr. Shropshire: Yes, it has a little k turn area.

Mrs. Tyndale: Who is responsible for snow removal?

Ms. Kosko: The township. They are public roads.

Mrs. Baggio: The HOA would do the sidewalks and walkways.

Mr. Petrone: Since they are fee simple lots, the individual homeowners may do their sidewalks.

Mr. Krisanda: I am the managing member of Longbridge Farms.

Mr. Petrone: A lot you will be testifying to this evening is the architectural appearance of the townhouse units. I know you have some exhibits and as go through your testimony we will identify them.

Mr. Krisanda: Marked exhibit A5. This illustrates what we do not want the units to look like which is a wall of all the same color siding with very little variations in terms of depth. I believe there was a misunderstanding that this was actually what we were proposing.

This is a different community to illustrate the depth and features. We have shutters on here. Its to give a better sense of what the rear unit will look like. These are hard to describe what we're going to do.

Mr. Petrone: This is exhibit A6, which is a rendering. It's a photograph but annotated to show some of the details that are going to be added to the townhouses proposed for Longbridge.

Mr. Krisanda: There will be eight locked indifferent color schemes throughout the community. The purchaser will not have a choice. The front colors will match the rear. There will be shutters on the rear of the building to spruce it up. There will be 3 different products marketed in the community. They are different depths, 30, 35, and 40 foot product. Every unit will stagger at least two feet, you may have 10 feet. There are also highly visible end units, so this is the side. We decided to make all the end units the high visible elevation. It will include shutters, windows, and things to break up the side.

Mr. Petrone: It is all designed to minimize so that it doesn't look like a row home. There are offsets and different architectural features that enhance townhouses of yester year.

Mr. Krisanda: Correct.

Mr. Petrone: With respect to how it ties into the subdivision plan and fee simple lots, obviously there are seven buildings proposed for the 45 townhouse units.

Mr. Krisanda: Typically, how it is handled. In this case we have eight different color schemes, they were provided in the packet. Typically, they would start at one end of the building and do colors 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. They would start over on the next building and keep going through the community. We will start with the 1<sup>st</sup> color and go through all eight before we start over the sequence. It just creates more of a variation.

Mr. Petrone: The color scheme and architectural features are locked in stone. That is the purchaser will not have an option to change the color scheme. The only option that impacts the exterior is that a homeowner may want a deck, is that correct?

Mr. Krisanda: Yes. There would have to be a permit.

Mr. Petrone: The decks would be second floor decks because the first floor being the garage space.

Mr. Krisanda: So, the way these three-story townhomes is, you enter in on the main level where you go up a flight of stairs to where your kitchen and living room are. That is where the deck would be.

Mr. McKay: Are you including specs is somebody decides to buy a townhouse without a deck and later changes their mind after move in and want to put a deck up. So that it is in conformity with your design standards.

Mr. Krisanda: The HOA will certainly have some restrictions and certainly the local building codes would probably come into play there.

Mr. Taylor: Actually, we ask for that as a condition of approval, so whatever the standard design is and whether it is fencing or a deck. It's included on these plans and that way the HOA and the homeowners know when they go to get a permit, there is no question. It will be whatever is specified and can't deviate.

Mr. Petrone: We don't have any problems putting limitations or restrictions in the HOA documents with respect to fencing, decks, and sheds. I think sheds are going to be prohibited on any of the townhouses. So, the HOA documents will provide that language as well as if we are limiting the homeowners to style and color of fencing. That will also be identified in the HOA documents in advance.

Mr. McKay: Backyard fencing?

Mr. Krisanda: Backyard fencing won't be provided. It will be limited to type and color choice.

Mr. McKay: So, you preserve the design and uniformity.

Mr. Petrone: Yes, along with location. So not to prohibit an interior unit from gaining access to his rear yard by going around the other buildings.

Mr. MacLachlan: What if they want to put a pool in?

Mr. Petrone: The HOA documents will state that there existing laws for any other improvements.

Mrs. Baggio: Even though they are fee simple, an HOA can still be responsible for things like snow removal and lawn maintenance. So, there is consistency to make sure everybody wants them. I live in a fee simple HOA and they take care of all that.

Mr. Petrone: I think the most important consideration of the HOA for this particular development is the maintenance of the stormwater basins and I think other items with respect to the contractual agreement between the townhouse purchaser and the other townhouse purchasers through the HOA documents.

Mr. MacLachlan: Did we get an answer on the pools?

Mr. Taylor: It's a good question. The problem that we run into is that Mrs. Newcomb gets caught up between the HOA. Someone brings in an application and then the HOA says that they are not allowed to bring in an application. That needs to be resolved, its ok if that does not get resolved until final.

Mrs. Newcomb: What needs to be distinguished here is difference between the townhouses and the single-family homes. It needs to be clearly defined.

Mr. MacLachlan: What is the setback for the pool?

Mrs. Newcomb: It is still 15'.

Mr. MacLachlan: The lot width is only 40'. So, its not possible.

Mr. Taylor: What happens if someone wants a hot tub? That's why our preferences and we're asked for it in the report to list all of those things. Does the HOA allow rear yard fences? If so, put in a simple design on the plans. Must do the same thing for sheds, pools, hot tubs, and anything else or Mrs. Newcomb and the Board will get caught in the middle.

Mrs. Newcomb: The zoning officer should see these documents and takes a look at them prior to anyone solidifying them and approving them because everyone goes away and we are stuck with them.

Mr. Petrone: I have no problem discussing with the zoning officer with her concerns and where she is encountering particular problems so the HOA documents can address that.

Mr. Bradley: Are all these restrictions being put into the documents.

Mr. Petrone: It will be in the HOA documents.

Mr. Krollfeifer: The end view of these units there are some windows and one solid.

Mr. Krisanda: It's just a fake window. Its architectural design. It is not a means of egress; nothing is going on the side.

Mr. MacLachlan: What age group do you expect to be your customer.

Mr. McNee: Typically, we see first-time buyers. Newlyweds for starter homes. Thirty to 40 percent are downsizing from larger properties, people who have gone through a divorce, and people who just want to come home park their car and be done for the day.

Mr. Miller: Luckily this whole site is flat, so you don't have a lot of grading. You may be able to do in one slab. It depends on the variation from one end to the other.

Mr. McNee: It would be one slab.

Mr. Clemons: Without looking at the grading plan, I can't tell you exactly what the variation is. It would be fairly uncommon that we would have a six or eight unit building that did not have some elevation difference along the slab. I don't remember exactly what housing is out here because it would be a little unusual for that to happen. If they were all the same, you could have a variation, normally the way we will design the townhouse building, I mean it would generally be two percent and we keep the driveways eight or under. So, we're not going to have that in either direction and if we did, they would force the steps into the slabs.

Mr. Krollfeifer: We are going to take a 5 minutes break.

Mr. Petrone: We are going to have Mr. Krisanda address one of the comments in Mr. Taylor's review letter with respect to storage, especially pertaining to trash cans, and what is going to be done to address that comment.

Mr. Krisanda: There's going to be an architectural change. We are adding a nook to the garage area.

Mr. McKay: Is it inside storage?

Mr. Krisanda: yes.

Mr. MacLachlan: Ask for clarification on what was being sought tonight.

Mr. Petrone: We weren't asking for any approvals associated with the commercial lot. Okay, other than creating it. With respect to the subdivision, we're creating the townhouse community preliminary approval for the townhouse project as well as the for singles. As part of the review or submission requirements, we were obligated to submit architectural renderings, floor plans and the light. They were further revised to address

comments included in the first review letters that were issued. When I say very beginning of October or end September. That's what the architectural plans that Mr. Krisanda has been testifying to that were submitted to the board in the form of packets that Mr. Krisanda testimony alluded to, and to address comments and review letter, second review letters just recently issued. So, this is the requirements of the redevelopment plan, as well as the submission requirements for the application before the board this evening.

Mr. Taylor: Did you submit the elevations and floor plans?

Mr. Krisanda: Referred to the 14 page document that shows elevations.

Mr. McKay: The last photo shows rear offsets.

Mr. Krisanda: It shows what they may look like, hypothetically. The least would be two foot offset to every unit.

Mr. McKay: Next to the last photo shows their offsets hypothetically of a more uniform nature that is less than the offset in the last. The last would also, if you imagine give you the offset for frontside too

Mr. Petrone: So, each unit will be staggered towards the front or staggered towards the back. The front will always be staggered two feet from unit to unit.

Mr. MacLachlan: How do we approve what you are doing because it's not sold yet.

Mr. Petrone: We have to comply with the approval and the approval is going to reference the exhibits that were provided to the Board.

Mr. Tricocci: What's your range, two foot to 10 foot.

Mr. McNee: The smallest floor plan is 32' and the largest is 42'. The maximum would be the two foot offset at the front plus the possible up to 10'.

Mr. McKay: Do we have a fire official letter accepting the design proposals and other fire related issues?

Mr. Petrone: He approved as submitted.

Mr. McKay: So, they are able to deal with the fire in the top floor places.

Mr. Petrone: Other issues may come into play through the construction code. We have submitted to the Fire Official and he did issue a letter dated September 22, 2022.

Mr. McKay: I'm trying to see if they feel they could fight a fire on the third floor.

Mr. Krisanda: We are back to where there is going to be a nook created for trash containers as a modification to the floor plan that were provided with the architectural to address comments from Mr. Taylor's review letter.

Mr. Petrone: Basically, all we are doing is pushing back part of the garage wall into the ground level open area behind the garage. We're creating a 4 x 6 area.

Mr. McKay: Big enough to handle the new recycling containers on wheels, the large version. Don't we have an ordinance that basically says garbage cans and trash containers are to be kept out of sight.

Mrs. Newcomb: That would be code enforcement. I do not know.

Mr. Krollfeifer: That is a township ordinance from a year ago.

Mr. Taylor: The redevelopment plan for this project specifically requires all trash and recycling will be stored inside the garages outside of the parking spaces. It is a requirement and a condition of their approval. They have the option to do a central trash compactor.

Mr. McKay: So, the requirement that the trash and recycling have to be in the garage should also be in the HOA.

Mr. Krisanda: Not a problem.

Mrs. Tyndale: Are the garages going to be large enough to fit a car with garbage and recycling containers because I couldn't put it in mine?

Mr. Petrone: The redesign with the nook will provide for both the trash containers and the parking, complying with the 9 x 18 requirement.

Mr. MacLachlan: So that boxed out window is an option.

Mr. Krisanda: That is standard feature with no option.

Mr. Petrone: The bottom line is that it's an illustrative of the staggering of the units within the building. Obviously, the frontage of every unit is going to be staggered two feet, whether or not in the rear it will either be two feet or greater depending on which unit the particular purchaser is purchasing. If it's the smallest unit next to the largest unit the rear stagger is going to be greater than two. It demonstrates that the front façade will not all be flush, the rear facades will not all be flush. Units next to each other will not be flush. The requirements of the redevelopment plan discuss the architectural features for the townhouse. Did we satisfy the redevelopment plan requirements for architectural. Part of the requirement was to also present it to the governing body and that was accomplished.

Mr. McKay: I think that the designs are pretty creative.

Mr. Petrone: Part of that is the amount of information present to try to demonstrate the undulations.

Mrs. Gilmore: If it is an option to have the back deck and nobody in that row decides to have it then the perception is the barracks.

Mr. McNee: Typically, we see about 60% will have the selection from day one.

Mr. MacLachlan: So, you have a slider there that is fenced off, so they can look outside.

Mr. Petrone: Based on the 60% that would be 27 out of the 45.

Mr. McNee: There maybe other ways to increase that such as there are mortgage incentives.

Mr. MacLachlan: Do you see many people put stairs down off the decks.

Mr. McNee: Not really just steps. Maybe steps from the deck. It's personal preference, security comes into play.

Mr. Petrone: One of the requirements of the redevelopment plan was that sustainable building practices be utilized. Can you identify the type of sustainable building practices that Ryan will utilize in this project?

Mr. McNee: So, there is low flow water fixtures, tankless hot water heaters, high efficiency products, everything is sealed tightly for no leakage, all led lighting throughout the home, ventilation systems for air quality.

Mr. McKay: Are you building to the energy star standard.

Mr. McNee: Beyond it.

Mr. MacLachlan: Are you hanging the condensers off the building or are they sitting on a pad.

Mr. McNee: On a pad.

Mr. Petrone: I have no further questions from my professionals. Does the Board or professionals have any questions?

Mr. Krollfeifer: I am looking at part of the big paperwork, CSO200. On Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road, immediately to the north of your property there are 7 existing dwellings. In between two of the dwellings it looks like a road but it is not, there is some very small print and I don't know what it says. Mr. Clemson can you take a look so that you can identify it on yours.

Mr. Clemson: There is nothing there now. It is just the way the tax map shows what is going on there.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Any questions from the Board? So, I will open to public comment.

Debra Plaia: Was sworn in. 50 Bancroft Lane. I want to revisit the stormwater management plan that was brought up earlier. I understand that it is going to be shared between the residential homeowners and the commercial owners. I am a little confused. Is the homeowner association going to maintain it or are they identifying residents within that development to maintain the retention pond?

Mr. Kingsbury: My understanding is the homeowner association is going to maintain it not individual homeowners.

Ms. Plaia: That was my concern because I am a lawyer and have a drowning case in a retention pond. I have learned a lot about them. I know that individual homeowners in a

development are not permitted under the NJ administrative code to maintain a retention pond.

Mr. Kingsbury: I believe that is true.

Ms. Plaia: I looked it up really quick. It says, responsibility for maintenance shall not be assigned or transferred to the owner or tenant of an individual property and a residential development or project unless such owner or tenant owns or leases the entire residential developmental project.

Mr. Kingsbury: So that it is not what the represented it was going to be.

Ms. Plaia: Okay. My other question is with respect to the retention pond, is there going to be fencing because part of it is about a residential property? My understanding and speaking with the experts in my case, is that there are now trending towards putting fencing and you know, planting shrubbery to prevent drowning, such as what happened in the case of that I have.

Mr. McKay: You keep using the word pond. The evidence is that this is not a pond, none of them.

Ms. Plaia: Is it a dry detention pond or a wet pond.

Mr. McKay: They are a non-wet vegetated area

Ms. Plaia: I didn't realize it was going to be a dry pond. Thank you.

Ken Pipes: Was sworn in. 35 Mt. Laurel Road. I got intrigued with the testimony of the builder about some of the things going to be involved in this development I thought I needed to speak. First of all, in green building, we try to orient the structures to the east west latitudes so that they get maximum exposure for solar. This added on later, are these units I couldn't see the north arrow are these designed to be east and west buildings are they designed to be north and south. Townhouses are in a row.

Mr. Clemson: It varies.

Mr. Pipes: How do they orient to the north?

Mr. Clemson: The townhouses that are along Road A are oriented in an East/West fashion. The townhouses on Road B are more or less northwest/southeast.

Mr. Pipes: I just converted my house to a ground source heat pump which uses a direct injection of freon into the ground rather than a water loop. Everything I build now as a nonprofit developer is all electric. And I don't know if you know the trend in the industry, as we're getting away from gas fired appliances because of global warming. Are these units designed to be all electric or will they'll be gas fired appliances?

Mr. McNee: Gas.

Mr. Pipes: I'd like to encourage you to rethink that, because the future is all electric. In regards to fences, the issue with most homebuyers who are new, newly married or young

families is they want places for the children to be able to play safely. So, fences are usually an issue for people who buy a house and then realize, oh, we need a fence or they have a dog or they don't want to go out on a leash and have to walk the dog. So, I think you need to really think about the usability of the properties that are built not just what the people at this table might think somebody should have because buyers have their own opinion. Sometimes when they're looking at properties, even after they buy their needs and desires change. Landscaping, the movement in the industry now is zero landscaping, which is low water usage. are you designing that as part of your landscaping plan? I would encourage you to do that, because that's certainly an issue for many parts of the country. According to the EPA, water is the next oil.

And we may need to be serious about water usage and the waste of water. Even though we think we have plenty of the aquifer under our soils. It's not unlimited. Are your units handicap adaptable? And are they a visitable design? And by that, I mean, if somebody is in a wheelchair, and they come to your house, can they get in? Can they use a bathroom on the first floor without having to worry about leaving your house in the middle of an event or a party or even a social visit to go find the bathroom someplace else? Are these units designed with that kind of intent?

Mr. McNee: They are not really ADA compliant.

Mr. Pipes: I would encourage you to look at the first floor designed to make the bathroom at least a handicap accessible. Those are the main things.

Mr. Krollfeifer: I'm looking at the floor plans and they do have a powder room option on that first floor. That will be the owner's decision correct.

Mr. Pipes: It would have to be designed to be able to be accessed by somebody in a wheelchair.

Mrs. Newcomb: You can't enforce that under a single-family dwelling.

Mr. Pipes: I wasn't suggesting that I think I felt they would consider it. That's a trend in the industry that we need to encourage people because folks that are handicap are limited to where they can go and who they can visit if units aren't in their terms this visitable. In regards to the setbacks, many communities have not only front yard setbacks where there's two foot minimum, but elevation differences so you don't have a row of roofs all in one line are yours designed to be at least six inches in separation?

Mr. NcNee: Yes.

Mr. Pipes: That's a good design. Thank you for hearing my concerns and considering these questions.

Charles Markovitz: Was sworn in: 2608 Fostertown Road. Well, I do have questions on this. A couple of things. One was, bear with me, I was looking up Eastern way. And of course, our map here we have questions regarding egress in and out of this place. I know that there was a study done and I would respectfully say I'm not sure how that was done. Meaning that a comment that was made was there was probably maybe 45 cars coming in and out of Hainesport Chase, for that size of the development

Mr. Krollfeifer: Please just direct your questions here. We'll get the answers for you. Okay. I believe that the testimony was that the traffic study was based on 45 Peak movement in and out of this development am and pm.

Mr. Markovitz: Easton Way, coming in and out of Hainesport Chase. Everybody thinks that is the main entrance into Hainesport Chase, and yet there's one at Fox Court, one at Craig Drive, and there's another one off of Route 38 as well as Creek Road. So, what I'm thinking is, and the developers are saying that 45 At peak, and if half of these people are new couples, for starters, I can't think of one, that's a stay at home mom or dad. So, I think 45 is awfully light and the projection, I think we're looking at somewhere in the 60, or 70 car range. I think that's going to impact the amount of traffic coming in and out of there tremendously, as well as Easton Way. One. The second comment that I want to make is the retention basin, the large one. I know there were some jokes floating around that you have two people that are going to share this, even though the homeowner's association, they're going to be responsible for it. But as the joke goes, over 50% of people get divorced. If you're going to blend a commercial, and residential, I think that's poor planning. In that, you get people in commercial settings. I can name them right up and down on Route 38 in Hainesport, that have gone out of business. I can use examples right in Mount Holly, that people get into trouble and they abandon their company, and they flee the state. Now, Hainesport and the local people are on the hook. I think you need to separate commercial and residential for drainage.

Mr. McKay: You would want the homeowner's association to be solely responsible to the township for the maintenance of the detention basin.

Mr. Markovitz: That is what is proposed right now that they are solely responsible. And then whatever agreement they have with their commercial neighbors. That's for them to work out. I would say that I think that is a bad idea.

Mr. McKay: What's a good idea.

Mr. Markovitz: To have commercial retention on its own and residential on its own. Last comment. And that would be and certainly because of density. I look at this proposal right now and that maybe I should have been involved earlier. This is brand new to me that this was happening. There is 48 unit and I know they are all taxable.

Mr. Krollfeifer: There are 45 units and 4 single-family. The single-family homes will be along Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road and the units will be inside.

Mr. Markovitz: Is it going to generate a lot more tax revenue or is it going to generate more costs and burden on our township? For example, trash removal, snow removal, schools. Well, I understand the schools are low right now. So, I don't see that as an issue right now. But as soon as you add children to it, you need more teachers and there will be an increase in cost in areas as well.

Mr. MacLachlan: The school is actually looking for some children. I would defer to Mr. Taylor that question of whether a 45 unit would be negative.

Mr. Markovitz: Ultimately, if it is not a tax neutral or negative, then is this the best use for that piece of land for our township?

Mr. MacLachlan: As you know, three quarters of our taxes go to the school. I'm guessing that these are \$400,000.

These are starter homes.

Mr. MacLachlan: I believe these are revenue creating. I'm not an expert.

Mr. Taylor: I would not guess. You could ask the developer if they have done an analysis or ask for something to that effect.

Mr. Markovitz: I understand that but is the best use of the land for us as homeowners and people that live in Hainesport.

Mr. Taylor: I can not answer that part. This is not the venue to discuss that part. We went through a rehabilitation/redevelopment designation process that had multiple public hearings. Various parcels were determined to be areas to be in need of redeveloped or rehabilitation. We went through the process and this area to be transitional between the Route 38 corridor and the existing single-family homes was identified as an area where transitional housing opportunity between single families and the Route 38 corridor would be appropriate. So, the Township Committee subsequently agreed to modify the zoning in this area facilitate for single families and lobbying for transitional townhouses. So that's really not for the board to decide, is this appropriate for this location? Now, we already have that when the Governing Body adopted the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. MacLachlan: I mean, over the years, the last big thing I recall, that wanted to come to that property was a waterpark. Then I think we had an Acme. I think there was a Lidl that wanted to come. We had pokes at us to fill the whole thing full of apartments. I've had personal contact with some developers. So, you are kind of doing this all the time. To just say, is that the best use? I don't think it's fair, you know, necessarily fair when you compare it to what could have been? I mean, is there anybody here that would want a giant waterpark there at this point in time? I don't know. It wasn't exactly there. But it was. It was Mr. Ravikio's property.

Mr. Markovitz: What I was looking at is an example is all commercial. Something except the single-family homes that would have less impact on the school. As soon as you go to all commercial. They're responsible for the trash. They're responsible for sewer, for snow removal. It doesn't create any additional burden.

Mr. MacLachlan: I don't think Mr. Ravikio had that opportunity. Nobody's come to him. How long was this placement for sale?

Mr. Ravikio: It's been in his family since the 1960's.

Mr. MacLachlan: You can see what we have now a nice town center. It looks like a high end little brick town. We haven't seen any kind of development like that behind Wawa. There either building warehouses or apartments today. That's really it. I'm actually happy that he's not in here trying to put 150 - 200 apartments on there. We don't want. The best use is the one that comes and it's manageable and that our planner and the county think it's appropriate.

Mr. Markovitz: The only thing I would ask you to consider is the separation of commercial and residential for drainage and the impact on traffic. I think the numbers are a little bit on the light side.

Mr. MacLachlan: The traffic engineer came in here before and he was right the last time.

Judy Meli: Was sworn in. 2615 Fostertown Road. I believe there are two open space lots in the plan.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Within this condominium complex, yes. I think that was a testimony.

Mrs. Meli: So, they're usable as far as like recreational.

Mr. Clemson: Passive lots.

Mrs. Meli: My other concern is the grading of the open fields where the commercial is going to be. You get a couple of days of heavy rain and that whole area floods just west of the tree line dividing the residential section and the commercial section. It doesn't drain. Judging from what I saw before, where the wetland tree area is. It is going to drain into the creek. If that's the case, there's a lot of dead trees that are either down or ready to come down, that are blocking that. So, there's going to be more water coming from the drainage from the field once they grade it. Something's going to have to be done with the trees. It has to be cleared out. The majority of it is on that property, not the residents

Mr. Krollfeifer: On the commercial property.

Mrs. Meli: Right. My other concern was you're talking about a fence around the drainage. But the tree area, once you grade this and there's water being drained, more water being drained into that tree area, there should be something around there as to keeping kids from going in that area from a townhouse.

Mr. MacLachlan: They testified that he was going to change the drainage more towards Route 38 then towards your house. She lives in the back on the Fostertown side and obviously has a concern.

Mr. Clemson: Most of the runoff from the property currently drains towards the wetland area. We are redirecting it towards Route 38 into a stormwater system. It will have a significant impact on the amount of water that was heading in that direction.

Mrs. Meli: Can something be done about all the dead trees.

Mr. Ravikio: I would love to clean it, maybe we can talk to the DEP.

Mrs. Meli: My husband and I did it until 2015 and we just can't physically do it anymore. When we get the rain like this where the field floods, the water can't drain across Fostertown. The beavers have it totally blocked.

Mr. Clemson: We may need a maintenance permit.

Mrs. Meli: Down the road, how hard would it be to convert the four way blinker to a working light?

Mr. Krollfeifer: That is not us, that is a county road.

Mr. MacLachlan: We can solicit for things like that. I'm sure that our township administrator, Mr. Taylor, and everybody would support it if it's needed to put a red light there.

Mrs. Meli: At one point you had talked about putting the portable radar on Fostertown coming from the blinker light towards 38, but that that didn't happen. I know the one on Broad Street is fixed.

Ms. Kosko: That is a county road. We don't have the ability to put a radar on there because it is county jurisdiction.

Mrs. Boettcher: Was sworn in. 520 Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. On Patty Burns house driveway right back to Cain's property used to be. I'm wondering if there wasn't a small spring because that was always wet on her property down her driveway. If you go down Mt. Laurel onto Fostertown, she's the first property. It was always wet, even before she built. I've been there 50 years. She had problems with her driveway. It was always wet. And I always wondering if there was a small water spring, if you know what I'm talking about.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Does anyone on the Board have an answer. We'll try to get one for you. Are there any other questions.

Ms. Kosko: There are six residents online. If anyone has a question or comment. No one is unmuting.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Closed public comment.

Board members, what's your pleasure? Any other questions?

Mr. McKay: This is a motion for preliminary approval with two design waivers.

Mr. Kingsbury: The design waivers they're asking for street setback and a buffer. landscaping setback.

Mr. Petrone: There was the 75 foot required setback to the county road, where they have 65.6. The second design waiver has to do with the 25' landscape buffer. There is a 25 foot area there with landscaping. We don't address all the requirements of the landscape buffer.

Mr. McKay: You're softening the buffer.

Mr. Clemson: It is apparently the requirement, very dense to the point where you would actually create a wall. We are asking relief from that and the proposed landscaping along Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. We will provide the appropriate aesthetics.

Mr. McKay: On the common EV issue, you're willing to abide by the opinion of the DCA?

Mr. Petrone: Yes.

Mr. Taylor: Also, inside the garages.

Mr. McKay: I thought there was an option to offer the homeowner 110 or 220 in the garage.

Mr. Clemson: There will be 110 and an option to add 220.

Mr. Petrone: This is where Mr. Taylor alluded to earlier whether it was a difference of opinion as to where the charging stations were required, whether those are the outside charges.

Mr. Taylor: Their opinion is, they're not required anywhere, or in garages, or within common areas. My reading of the law is there are only two exclusions, one-family and two-family. All of the other townhouse projects that we've been involved with, the developer has agreed to provide charging infrastructure within at least 15%, which is the number of required by law in those units. If the applicant only provides it as an option, and no one takes the option, then we have zero. So, my suggestion for both the interiors of garages, as well as the common is the applicant agrees to comply final resolution, the issue will be as determined by DCA.

Mr. MacLachlan: Are the services underground for all the units?

Mr. Clemson: Yes.

Mrs. Newcomb: Is the HOA an off-site management company or is it the community itself?

Mr. Petrone: I don't think that has been determined yet.

Mr. Kröllfeifer: I want to go back over this traffic study because I think Mr. Markovitz raised a valid point. I'm wondering if for the benefit of anybody else who's listening. Plus, me I would like to know, could our traffic study gentleman just address that because we keep talking 45 units. So, let's forget the four houses. Just in my own mind, that has to develop more than 45 vehicles. Because if it didn't, when you don't need a drive where you can just have an apron and go into the garage. So, why are you setting up 15 or so parking spaces here and 11 over there? Whatever it is it just it sounds to me like you're planning for closer to 100 vehicles in this and they're presumably going to go in and out. Mr. Markovitz, this point is worth taking, it's probably going to be a bunch of young couples, both going to work every day coming home every night. Just maybe make me feel a little better about the traffic going in and out of there.

Mr. Shopshire: We use national data and actually contribute to the data with traffic counts. This data is validated and accepted all over. Single family homes are more intense than multi family in traffic generations. The community that he lives in has a fair mix of different residents. My wife and I have high school kids, neighbors next door has kids, and the other neighbor is retired. Our next door neighbor was a UPS driver who left at 5am. I left at 6am. My one neighbor didn't leave at all. My wife left at 8am. You start accumulating on what that traffic will do. During peak hours a single family home will generate on average one trip during peak. A multi-family would be less than 1 trip. By the end of the day all those trips have accumulated into the development. There's

parking requirements which show the level that you're talking about to accommodate all those cars but they all come in and out over a 24 hours period. When we do our peak hours there's studies that have, we can look at the worst case scenarios. Those numbers are very valid and keep being supported over and over. The update is done by the Institute of Transportation.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Just one last question. I understand on Road A and Road B, there's going to be one side parking only. Is that correct? Read it somewhere.

Mr. Clemson: It is a 30' wide road, parking is allowed on both sides. But in the townhouse areas, a lot of that will really be dictated by the proximity of one driveway to another. Because the lots are 20' lots and the driveways are 10. From a practical stand point, if you're along the frontage of six townhouses, you're probably not parking on the street, in front of those houses. There will not be enough room. The parallel spaces that we illustrated on the site plan were away from those areas. Given the width of the street, which is 30 feet based on the RSIS, parking is permitted on both sides.

Mr. McKay: Motion to grant preliminary, grant the two design waivers that have been proposed and clarified. I don't think we have to memorialize the EV portion or do we.

Mr. Kingsbury: I will put it in. They have to comply with that.

Mr. McKay: There is a difference of opinion of EV and it's going to be resolved by agreement of parties to be resolved by DCA. They have agreed to comply with the planner and engineer's comments.

Second: Mrs. Tyndale

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

Motion carries to approve.

**C. Case 21-08B: Robert DiPiero c/o Coreone Industrial  
Block 98 Lots 2.01, 2.02, 2.08  
Along Mary Way, near Route 38 and Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road  
Minor Subdivision, Preliminary/Final Site Plan  
Attorney: Robert Baranowski**

Mr. Kingsbury swore in the following witnesses: Robert DePiero, CoreOne; Brian Conlon, PE, Langan; Kim Dechen, AIA, Architect; Alan Lothian, PE, traffic, Langan; Sean Moronski, PP, Langan.

Mr. Baranowski: So, my name is Robert Barron ASCII. As you noted, I'm an attorney with the law firm of Highland Levin Shapiro, in Marlton representing the applicant in this matter this evening. This is an application for development of two warehouse buildings with associated site improvements, including parking, landscaping, lighting, stormwater management facilities, all those activities will take place on lots 2.01 and 2.08. They will be permitted uses on those lots. We've requested that site plan approval in connection with a minor subdivision approval to create a new lot 2.10 also to extend Mary Way, that's 2.01 is a split zone. So, the two buildings were proposing and requesting site plan

approval for this evening. Or next as the case may be, would both be in the industrial zone with the configuration of that new lot under the minor subdivision. So our proposed warehouse A which would be lot 2.08 would be 42,532 square feet give or take of warehouse space with 1,513 square feet of office space and warehouse B on lot 2.01 would be approximately 41,527 feet with 3,033 square feet of office space. Access to the site would be from Mary Way, which is private road and proposed to be extended further than it currently exists. That's actually designated as lot 2.02 on the tax map. We would extend it further to service the two proposed buildings and certain improvements just so you're aware and our engineer can explain this further. Certain of the improvements associated with the proposed development include improvements to the entrance at Mary Way and Hainesport Mount Laurel Road. Some of those improvements will go on portions of block 98 Lots 2 and 2.03. There's also a proposed shared driveway in the proposed configuration to buildings that crosses over lot 2.07. So, the owners of all those lots have given consent into the application. So, all of those properties, as you'll see are listed in the application. But the actual development itself was really concentrated on the lots that I mentioned. The witnesses that were just sworn in, just to the board knows. Mr. Robert DePiero with us from Core One, Brian Conlon with us, he's our engineer from Langan. I have Kim Dechan is also with us. She is our architect and TK Studio. We also have Mr. Alan Lothian, who's our traffic engineer. He's also with Langan, and Sean Moronski, is with us tonight. He's a planner with Langan,

It is already 10:25. That's a basic snapshot of the application. You've seen the witnesses is a World Series game on, I know, you're very tired. We really sincerely appreciate all of you being here this evening. The time that you spend giving the service to the township, I would ask rather than getting started going any further this time, I'm sure you're going have questions. I know people from the public are here to make some comments. I don't know if anybody is on Zoom. Looking forward on things, I know that your typical cut off time is 11 o'clock.

Mr. Krollfeifer: That's for new business and you already started. So, we're here.

Okay. I did start, we did open the application. If you want us to continue, I'd be happy to just wanted to take your temperature on that. We want to be respectful of your time. I don't want to hold you hostage here. So, under the circumstances, if you're fine to proceed, we're fine to proceed. If you're wishing you weren't here and going forward with it. We want to be respectful of that. And it is a late hour and under all the other circumstances we know of. I don't want to really, you know, belabor the application.

If I can have Mr. DePiero speak briefly. He's a representative for Core One, I think he can give you a little bit of a table setting in three minutes. And kind of give you an overall picture of what the proposed buildings would be, you know, what would they be and who would be in there?

Mr. DePiero: A little overview of Core One Industrial we own and operate about 1.7 million square feet of industrial assets. We started our industrial footprint in southern New Jersey, I've spent a lot of time up and down the New Jersey Turnpike and between Mt. Laurel, Hainesport, Swedesboro. In the local communities around here. We've designed this building with lots of detail to a local user. As you'll see in the plans, it's I'll use rough numbers, it's approximate two 45,000 square foot buildings. We don't design and build big bomber industrial buildings that appeal to large distribution centers, like the Amazons, you know those kinds of users. So, these buildings were designed with a

thought in mind. And I'm not going to swear any or bringing any exhibits. I'll have Brian do that later. But just so you guys have in the background. So, these are designed in support of local community. It's really to have a local, local user, be able to grow and stay in the community or downsize in the community stay local. And it really appeals to a local user base rather than the large national distribution kind of traffic truck traffic that you see out there in the market.

Mr. McKay: One user for each building or two users>

Mr. DePiero: So, the one building on the bottom left is designed as a single tenant building. It's a 45,000 square foot single tenant building. The other long linear one does have two office potential locations. So that could be designed for a two tenant building. So, it's you know, 45,000 square feet approximately that could get divided into two in any way, shape and form. So, you know, a 20 and a 25. You know, again, round numbers. So yeah, it could be subdivided. The thought process behind these buildings is it ties into what's on Mary way already, Mary Way consists of four buildings that are 40,000 square feet each, approximately. Again, they're square in nature, similar to the building we designed, which is building A, Building B is a little more linear front load, probably a little bit of a different layout and feel to a different kind of user base. So, our engineer will dive into a lot more of the site layout and design features. But as you see, it's two buildings that we're proposing. We're looking to in this application improve what is Mary Way right now, I know there's a lot of concern from local neighbors who have called me directly after they've seen our application. And I've talked to on a, you know, personal conversations offline, about fixing potholes, we're not happy with the speed bumps that are located there, because it creates a lot of noise when the truck is filling over when they have empty beds. So, it's just creating a lot of noise and ruckus. So, the plan is, with our neighbors on the other buildings on Mary Way, and with Perry Videx is to have a maintenance agreement in place. So, there's one point of contact, there's one company that's maintaining it, everybody has self-help rights. So, we can maintain it if that's not being performed properly, but the current state of Mary Way will be improved. Once you know with this project being approved, hopefully in the future. We're also proposing a pretty big upgrade to the access on Hainesport Mount Laurel Road. It will allow truck traffic to come in and off the site much easier than it does today, where you get trucks getting stuck coming in and out if there's a truck coming each way. So, a lot of improvements for the Mary Way and Hainesport Mount Laurel Road ingress a lot of upgrades for Mary Way and itself and then obviously bringing in two new buildings that appeal to a totally different user base than what we've seen pop up around both the local community and the region. So that's what we're proposing. In a nutshell,

Mr. McKay: Do you I read your plans to show that the Mary Way and Hainesport Mt.. Laurel Road intersections will become a t.

Mr. DePiero: Not necessarily a t and internally it will become a t. So, it gets moved away from the current last residential house more onto the Perry Videx site, and allows for better circulation coming out of Mary Way to loop in and around to make a left where the truck traffic actually won't get sort of Jackknife with oncoming traffic that's going to be coming onto the site as well. There are also other county improvements of widening Hainesport Mount Laurel Road, which allows for two way traffic and passing when a trucks are making a left in there. So, there will still be a lot of car traffic to go around it while a trucks waiting to turn onto the site. Right. It will also allow trucks coming away

from Route 38 up to make an easier right-hand turn into Mary Way unencumbered by the trucks coming out. So, it'll create much smoother access to and from the site.

Mr. McKay: Has the approvals from the county already been given?

Mr. DePiero: I believe the county blessed this in less than 10 minutes. They were on board with us pretty quickly.

Mr. McKay: Then what about the speed bumps that you did mention? Are they going to be eliminated?

Mr. DePiero: I believe those are installed because of past town recommendations and requests. So, I have no problem eliminating them and as does the other owners of the Mary Way building so, we can get rid of them. We can leave them. Honestly, I don't think it serves a purpose because there's a pretty sharp bend there and with truck traffic, I don't think that trucks are going to be flying down that road.

Mr. MacLachlan: So, you don't own the other four?

Mr. DePiero: No, it's another industrial group. I have a good relationship with them.

Mrs. Kelley: Have you ever tried to contact Route 38 because there is a pretty wide property that I'm aware of? I guess it is the Health Haven food and then there is a vacant property. Then there is this wide property that if you've lived here for a long time, it's the old Davis property. They had a business right on 38. That is still pretty empty now and it seems to me that that could be a very good way.

Mr. DePiero: Right now, we have not contacted 38 or worked with the state on trying to have access to and from it. It's a much different level of approvals with state traffic and DOT. So, we haven't contacted them yet, but we would be open for future correspondence.

Ms. Kosko: Currently Farro Point owns Mary Way, Lot 2.02 and as well as lots 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. DePiero: Yes.

Ms. Kosko: Is there a maintenance agreement in place now with the Stevens?

Mr. DePiero: Yes, there's a new maintenance agreement that we just put in place which the town should have that was submitted a couple weeks ago.

Ms. Kosko: Farro Point is going to retain ownership of 2.0?

Mr. DePiero: They're going to keep the maintenance aspect of it and then we'll have self help rights if for some reason they don't fill a pothole, we can do it, or vice versa. They are going to be the point person in the contact for maintaining Mary Way.

Mrs. Newcomb: If I remember correctly, the speed bumps were put in there because at that time there was a lot of recreational use. Once you get past a point, you have a speedway. There was a concern with so many children and family type activities. Some of those businesses are gone.

Mr. DePiero: There are still some. We probably could get rid of the speed bump on the bend. That is the one that backs up to the residential houses. If we get rid of that and fill the three foot potholes that are associated around it, would probably take care of a lot of the noise. We might want to keep them on that far stretch, you know, maybe before building 3.

Ms. Kosko: You are extending Mary Way, which in essence is going to be lot 2.08.

Mr. Conlon: It will still be 2.02 but we will be extending.

Ms. Kosko: Who is going to own it?

Mr. DePiero: That would go into Mary Way. So, we're taking 2.02 and extending it out through.

Ms. Kosko: So, they are going to retain ownership of that little new stretch.

Mrs. Newcomb: Is the sign staying there?

Mr. DePiero: The sign will need to be relocated as part of our widening. I will reach out to Farro Point and figure out a new location for it.

Mayor MacLachlan: When you came to see the Economic Development Committee, you had a third building. Are you still looking at that?

Mr. DePiero: Not at this time. We are going to the minor site division right now to really just work within the industrial zone and not the front retail commercial zone.

Mrs. Newcomb: Do you have tenants for the building?

Mr. DePiero: They are speculative.

Mr. Conlon: Gave credentials. Our survey which is sheet four of the set. He pointed out the location. The lots that are part of the application, 2 and 2.03 are the Perry Videx lots, Lot 2.07 is the building right adjacent to where we are posing building A, lot 2.08 is where building A will be going and that's currently basically at the end of Mary Way. It is currently used as a gravel parking lot. Buses are currently parked. The big lot at the end of Mary Way which is wooded today. Mary Way is lot 2.02. The majority of the site is all industrial zone. The general commercial one basically comes up just splits. Everything we are going is in the industrial zone. Both our buildings are permitted uses in the industrial zone. As Mr. DePiero mentioned, we have pointed out five existing buildings is even little squares on the site are all just about 3,000 square feet. And proposing one right next to that which you will see in a moment. Again, is pretty much in character with the existing buildings on the site.

In addition to our site plan, we actually have a subdivision application which I am going to go through first. Exhibit marked as A1. A2 is our minor subdivision plan.

This is a blow up of the area at the end of Mary Way, proposed lot as part of our subdivision. So, lot 2.02 which is Mary Way is being extended this small little sliver here. The existing lot is 2 ½ acres and were extending it and marking it 2.9. 2.08 is were

building A will be going and we are extending that lot a little bit. That lot is going from 3.3 acres to 4.3 acres. The very large wooded lot which is the existing lot 2.01 is being broken into 2 lots. It is currently 21 acres. The top lot will be 13 ½ acres and the balance of the lot down here, we're calling proposed lot 2.10. So, it doesn't exist yet. That is the general commercial lot of the zoning. We are creating that one and that one is proposed at 6.4 acres. All the lots are conforming and zoning criteria. Any questions on the subdivision before I move on to the site plan.

Mr. Krollfeifer: I am looking at VL105. Is there water running through lot 2.01?

Mr. Conlon: Yes. There is a drainage ditch that comes from Route 38. There are a couple pockets of wetlands throughout the site.

This is exhibit A3. For reference this is CS102 site construction plan 2. It's drawing 12 of 45. This is a blow up of the site plan that we are proposing. Two buildings which I would reference building A, which is the southern building. Building B is the northern building. We put building A here which is approximately 185' by 238'. It is 44,045 square feet. The warehouse component which is 42,532 and an office component which is 1,513 located in the southeast corner. Building A and B they are very similar in characteristics. Building B is more of a narrow building that is 392' by 140', 44,560 square feet. Total warehouse component 41,527 square feet with two offices located at the northeast corner and southwest corner. One is 1,533 square feet and the other is 1,500 square feet. Basically this is where Mary Way stops today and then this is that gravel parking lot and we're extending Mary Way into the proposed building.

Looking at the blow up, there is the wetland that's here and a ditch that goes through the undeveloped portion of the project, we're not disturbing the ditch here or the wetlands either. There are some buffers associated with the wetland that we are impacting the buffers and we're going for our NJDEP permits. Building A circulation basically around both sides of the buildings. There are 70 parking spaces proposed, where 65 are required. They're basically on the left side of the building behind the building and the right side of the building.

We have 11 loading docks along the frontage, very similar to the buildings adjacent loading along the Mary Way frontage. On the left side, we're actually talked about this a little bit later against variances. It's an existing driveway that we're sharing with the adjacent lot 2.07 There will be an easement agreement for that shared use of the driveway and also mentioned there's parking there because of the driveway. One of the variances that we're asking for is a zero-foot setback again because it's an existing driveway for parking and we have parking in the impervious area, which again is similar to across the driveway.

Trash in building A is located in southwest corner so it can be serviced from the driveway on the side. Building B we have the potential of two users. It will have two potential parking areas, one along the frontage of Mary Way and one kind of in the upper corner where the two offices were located. Similarly, this has a loading docks along the eastern side of the building, seventeen docks. There are seven trailer parking not for tractor trailers but just trailer parking slips on the east side.

The parking for this partial, you have 59 proposed parking spaces where 72 are required. So, we are seeking relief there. This also is adjacent to the building here in this location we have room to service and trash.

Mr. McKay: On warehouse B. Typically, in many other cases our fire official has sought 360-degree access around the building by way of an access or fire road How are you dealing with warehouse B in terms of the fire officials approval.

Mr. Conlon: I haven't seen anything from the fire official. They do not have full access around.

Ms. Kosko: The project has been approved by the fire official on April 13, 2022 and September 22, 2022.

Mr. McKay: I am looking at CS102. I see the wetlands delineation. It looks like it sticks out in a little bit of a bubble into your paved area. Are you asking for waivers on that?

Mr. Conlon: Correct. The wetland does not stick out. There is a 50' buffer associated. We do have an application for that to the DEP.

Mr. Taylor: I think the prior survey and I think there is with a reference to a prior LOI or wetlands survey.

Mr. Conlon: There was a previous LOI given in 2007 that represented the wetlands here and we're in for a new application now, as shown here. So, I think you might be mentioning our previous survey did show a wetlands the top of bank and not level. There are no wetlands associated with the drainage ditch.

Mr. Taylor: You can submit copies of the LOI?

Mr. Conlon: Yes.

Exhibit A4. This is our grading and drainage plan 2. Page 17 in the packet, drawing cg102. Generally everything flows from west to east. Small scale infiltration basins on each site, apparently you see the shaded area here are building A. There are two subsurface basins below the parking lot. In building B, we have one subsurface basin here below the parking lot and then a smaller surface basin that you would see up in the north corner. Everything's treated collected going into the basin and there are two outfalls. One up here in the wetlands and then one down here closer to the drainage ditch. we have water quality units for pretreatment for all the systems for pavement runoff. We have an application for the freshwater wetland line verification. We have general permits for gas and water, our transitional impact, and for their isolated wetland over here that we're filling in. There are three general permits that we are asking for. Addition to that also the flood hazard area verification for this. That has been filed. I don't have a utility plan to show you. We are serviced by the MUA sanitary sewer we're going to be all the way out Mary Way out to Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. Water, gas, electric, everything in Mary Way and we anticipated connecting with all the existing services.

Mr. Krollfeifer: At the corner where you extend marry way out and right there Yes, what's going to be on this side that goes down to that corner. What I'm getting at is

there's a habit some places in our town where trucks like to cut across things when they're not supposed to go what's going to be there.

Mr. Conlon: The whole road will be curbed. We have a small retaining wall from here to here. In addition to that there would be a swale that drainage ditch that would be just outside of that curve line as well.

Next is our landscape plan, A5. Drawing 37 of 45 in our plan. Landscaping will be throughout the site and we will work with Mr. Taylor on that. We are proposing 43 trees, 46 evergreen trees, 219 shrubs, and 1,294 ground cover planting. We are providing a 15' buffer that is required adjacent to the general commercial zone which is along the rear and over here. Again, keep in mind all of this is vegetated and you know we're against the different vegetation on the right side. We are providing as much or as buffers for parking and loading. We do have a large driveway here that we can't landscape around. We're providing the buffer in front of the parking building B. We really need to require the amount of parking or trees for the necessary parking spaces. We have enhanced our plans from our previous submission. Street trees along Mary Way at 50' on center. Basically, everywhere we can. Additional trees in the stormwater management basin. Mr. Taylor has some comments and we'll be happy to work with him.

Lighting we do have a combination of wall packs on the building and full mounted lighting. We are meeting the height requirements of the ordinances and in addition we're meeting the foot candle requirements. We did work with Mr. Taylor and his office. We were advised the type of fixtures with the 3,000. Again, I think there is a couple other comments that will certainly address in Mr. Taylor's letter.

The last I want to talk about is the roadways. Exhibit A6 and is drawing KO101, sheet 41 of 45. This is at the intersection of Mary Way and County Road 674. In working with the county and with your professionals as well. There were concerns about this access. The county requested a minor widening of the road. You can see the little shaded area on the north side of the roadway. We are widening there to get 20 foot. That is for bypass as trucks are making a left turn in. There is adequate distance to bypass. In addition, we're significantly enlarging this intersection. In fact, the shaded area in gray on the right, that's all new pavement. So basically that's currently all grass and we're widening that approximately 20 feet. We are widening to open up that intersection. And that's basically for trucks making all movements so there are no conflicts. In a scenario today if someone was parked here, a truck may not be able to get in or out because of the stacking.

Mr. Krollfeifer: That is right by Perry Videx. What is that other gray area. That is where they have a bunch of rusty equipment right now.

Mr. Conlon: We are basically cutting into the existing Island and creating this T intersection. This makes it much smoother for the same reason out here, the trucks going in and out. Same with internally in the site, there's trucks going in and out. This is an improvement for those conflicting movements. This has been submitted to the county. They have one minor comment that we are going to address.

Mr. Miller: I agree.

Mr. Conlon: I am going to address some of the comments in Mr. Taylor's letter that haven't been address. I'm going back to exhibit A3 which is our site plan. We are requesting a variance for the parking setback on the side of the building, 15' is required for parking and we have 0 proposed. That is an existing driveway that is there today. There is parking on the opposite side of that driveway. We're doing a similar scenario on the right side because of the driveway scenario. We don't see any negative impact. We think it works well.

There are a couple design waivers associated with building A. The loading zone location are only permitted on the side and rear yards. We are proposing a front load scenario along Mary Way, which is in the setback. We think it's justifiable but it's existing conditions of this industrial park.

Another waiver similar to that is the loading zone access backing into the loading from Mary Way.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Are they going to be 18 wheelers?

Mr. Conlon: Yes, there could be. We have designed it for the biggest trucks. We did not provide the buffer here because of the loading zone. We enhance as much as we could in these two corners. We have green areas on both sides of the loading dock. We tried to enhance that landscaping; we can certainly do a little bit more as we work with Mr. Taylor.

Building B has one variance as well. That is a parking setback for the front 19 parking spaces. The requirement is 35' setback for parking, we are proposing 15'. This is more for where the building is and the use of intensity. We are also trying to meet the parking requirements. We are a little short on the on the required parking on the building B, so we feel parking is needed there. That is the variance requested and then the design waivers. I just mentioned the parking spaces, they are a designed waiver. We have 71 required, we're proposing 59. We get credit for 61 because we are providing the electric vehicle charging station. two parking spaces to each building. So we get credit for two times the space.

Just some general comment about the trash. Both building will have your typical trash enclosures and recyclables, for craft pallets, crates, or anything else. We don't know who the end users are yet, if is needed to be made bigger we will certainly adjust it accordingly, based on the tenant. We are confirming that there is no outside storage or display of materials, products, merchandise, equipment, or any outdoor fabrication assembly and manufacturing. That note has been added to the plans. We believe we will be in compliance with all applicable local and state regulations. We don't see anything out of the ordinary here. We don't anticipate any sound attenuation or anything such as sound walls. Mr. DePiero did a good opening on the condition of Mary Way. We will certainly work with Alaimo to do any kind of improvements that are necessary along Mary Way.

Mr. Taylor mentioned in his letter about adding a sidewalk potentially along Mary Way. There is no sidewalk in the business park today. We don't think it's really necessary. There's nothing actually on the highway 674 either. We don't anticipate one user going to another building here. Bike racks were mentioned, we don't know if people will be biking there, not opposed to it. Why trailer spaces on this building, it is to drop off

trailers. Typically, users want trailer spaces depending on the user. Wo, if we can get them, we fit them in. We do not anticipate any fences or gates on either building.

As far as the rest of the comments, we will work with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Krollfeifer: What are the hours of operation for both facilities?

Mr. Conlon: We don't know at this time. They will operate with what is allowed in this zone.

We have addressed most of the comments in Mr. Miller's letter. I believe there are a couple stormwater items we are working on. In speaking with his office, there was a comment about one of our tests pits and we're doing in some infiltration testing. We will address it any way we need to whether it is environmental. We don't think its an environmental concern but I know they will comment on it. We plan on complying with all of the Alaimo letter.

Mr. Baranowski: I would like Kim Dechen, our architect, to show you the rendering so that you get an idea of what the buildings will look like.

Ms. Dechen gave her credentials and the Board accepted.

Ms. Dechen: This is a rendering, exhibit A7, that we put together for building A and this is from Route 38. This corner down here is the area of concern with the residential. This is Route 38 and this is the loading dock off the back. So, what we've done is we've brought the more attractive and pedestrian side of the building to 38 in the residential side. So, the main building I know there's questions about materials the main building is a metal panel that's a darker kind of helps fade away the mass of the building. And then we have these bump outs in these two corners of the building. This is the main corridor that has the potential office space with the storefront and the awning and the more attractive area.

Mr. Krollfeifer: So, the traffic will be on the backside, Mary Way side.

Mr. Baranowski: I am marking the floor plans for building A, exhibit A8. Building B is A9 rendering and A10 is building B floor plan.

Ms. Dechen: So, the rendering for building B is taken from if you're looking at no building from this direction. So, when you come down Mary Way, you'll come at it from here, so you'll see the office area which is this corner. Same detailing the building will be coordinated with this is a nicer more decorative bump out. The nicer features beyond the storefront and then it wraps around to the loading docks on the back side. In the back corner back here is where the other proposed office could go should it be two tenants or a driver office. We really tried to dress up the building.

Mr. Baranowski: Anybody have any questions with the building elevations or floor plans?

Mr. Krollfeifer: Is 40' the height?

Ms. Dechen: Yes, 40' is the tallest point. The accent areas are 40' and the main building.

Ms. Newcomb: COAH?

Mr. Baranowski: The non-residential residential development fee, two and a half percent equalized assessed value.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Any questions from the Board for the architect?

Mr. Taylor: I just want to clarify. Will all the office mechanicals be on the roof or will they be screened?

Ms. Dechen: So the top part here will be taller than the building. Since they are warehouses we don't have a future tenant, but the assumption would be the main warehouse is probably not air conditioned. Anything in the future they would have to screen. I feel it would all be internal, any rooftop units that would be required for office space this is the area.

Mr. Conlon: We are willing to screen.

Ms. Newcomb: Are you building it to specs for future solar?

Mr. Conlon: We personally haven't done any solar in our industrial buildings. The reason for that is the fire issues they have been having.

Mr. Taylor: Are you aware of the new law that warehouses and distribution facilities of certain sizes all have to be wired.

Mr. Conlon: I don't believe that these fall into that.

Mr. Taylor: We may want to just to the extent that it is applicable whatever the law of future wiring of the solar.

Mr. Conlon: If it's applicable we will comply.

Mr. Krollfeifer: No signage is anticipated on the buildings?

Ms. Dechen: No not at this time.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Are there any questions from the Board or professional staff?

Mr. Taylor: The one item sort of remains outstanding is the position of the signs because they have to remove or relocate two signs with the Mary Way internal intersection configuration. If there were variance granted before based on the sizes, we really don't have any design or anything to base our relief on. They will have to put a smaller sign in and comply with all the setbacks or hold off for a month and get something in, or come back to the Board at some point.

Mrs. Newcomb: Some of the tenants depend on the sign. A lot of thought went into that sign and it is a beautiful sign.

Mr. Baranowski: It sounds like we will have to come with a sign variance plan on the specific location once we determine exactly where they are going to be.

Mrs. Newcomb: I suggest talking to them, it is technically their sign.

Mr. Taylor: Are you saying coming back next month or as a subsequent application?

Mr. Baranowski: As a subsequent application.

Mr. Krollfeifer: The comment that came up earlier regarding if Mary Way is a private road, a street, or a road and it was decided to be a street.

Mr. Taylor: It is a private road. Under the land use law, it has a couple of distinctions. It has been referred to as a street. That is why we also commented on that it be brought up to municipal standards because it is not a driveway, it is a street. I just happen to be owned by a private entity.

Mr. Krollfeifer: That private entity maintains it.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, we have had significant conversations and had a lengthy comment in our report of all those maintenance responsibilities obligations etc. to be dually vetted by the professionals.

Mr. Miller: The only thing I just recently came across, they did some soil testing for the detention areas. One test that went 20', 16' of it was trash. So there will be more investigation and approved by DEP to find out what is going on there.

Mr. McKay: It implies that it was a land fill at one point.

Mr. Miller: We don't know it was only one test.

Mr. Baranowski: We agree that is going to be an outside agency approval and we would have to get a license site remediation professional to investigate that further to find out what is going on there. If there is a problem, we agree that it would be address.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Opened public comment.

Mr. Pipes: I was sworn in earlier. My house is at the corner of Mary Way and Hainesport Mt Laurel Road. I am the closest to the revised proposed intersection. But as I look at the plan CD101, and others that following it, I see this also impacting the other side of the road where my neighbors having light poles that are being replaced and various other improvements. As I understand your testimony, that's going to be widened, with paving additional paving on both sides or only one side or neither side.

Mr. Conlon: Just the north side.

Mr. Pipes: Opposite side from my house. My house is in the triangular portion of the corner. The question of Mary Wau being a private road or street came up when I talked to the zoning officer, Mrs. Newcomb, that I wanted to put a pole barn in the back of my house. She said I had to have a 35 foot setback from the street. There's a 25-foot strip that runs in the back of my property all the way to where the new development was on 38 That's the way they got sewer and had the permission to build those commercial units there. So, I wanted to buy that strip, so I could have a little bit more room behind my house to put the pole barn. Mrs. Newcomb if I remember what she said accurate. She said

I have to be 25' from the road. So buying that 25 feet was still not letting me build any closer because even though I owned it, it still hadn't be 35 feet back. Is that intended to be incorporated into the site plan? Are your buying the 25' strip.

Mr. Conlon: There is an easement agreement in place with Perry Videx.

Mr. Pipes: It is not Perry Videx property, it belongs to Bruni. Let me just say that I'm not opposed to develop and I don't care what you build back there. Nobody is ever going see it anyway, unless you walk my dog back there like I have where the buses are parked. But the reason I'm here is this, I'm concerned about the increased traffic on Hainesport Mount Laurel Road that is going to turn into that corner. That speed bump right behind my house wakes me up at five o'clock in the morning, when the empty trucks come and they go over that speed bump. It jars my house and wakes me up.

Mr. McKay: The speed bump they are going to eliminate.

Mr. Pipes: Yes. I'm not sure that won't increase the speed of the traffic coming around that corner. Easier to make that turn and then come down that road. Mrs. Kelly asked the question which I was going to ask also, why not coming off a route 38 which is the state highway designed for heavy traffic and commercial trucks rather than all of the recycling trucks that come from OTC down the bypass turn now Marne Highway and then come right down Hainesport Mt. Laurel Road. They could go the bypass all the way to 38 and come down to Mount Laurel or wherever they're going but they have to come down Hainesport Mount Laurel Road.

Mr. Taylor: That was actually something that was discussed very early on with the applicant. Unfortunately, the whole highway frontage along Route 38 is zoned commercial. So, putting in a driveway for an industrial project through a commercial district would not be a permitted use. It would require a d variance for the property. The applicant chose to submit a compliant use, keeping all of the access and all the proposed development in the industrial zone district.

Mr. Pipes: I know you've done a lot of work and spend a lot of money because I have done development myself. D variances aren't as easy to get but I have gotten them myself. But if it's the right thing to do, then it's the right thing to do. Why do the easy and quick way when it's not the right way. I'm asking the Board is to make it a plan that serves everyone, not just some people.

Mrs. Newcomb: The previous owners, Stevens, they had a plan before they decided to sell this property. This was about 10 years ago. The owner was married to the engineer. They sent two applications to the State of New Jersey, and both times they lost their entire application. One of the things they would have had to do was the entire Bancroft jughandle area. They were looking to put flex buildings on this site. The amount of time and work to get that driveway and the cost would be forced them to redo the jug handle was out of limits for them. That's why they stopped.

Mr. Pipes: Well, I don't want to be obstinate, but I am. I don't think it's going to make the neighborhood better. It will make it worse. I'll live with it; I bought that house knowing it was next to an industrial complex and industrial recycling company whose equipment was stored out there and rusting away. We've actually bought some equipment from them and I'm not opposed to that they have to be someplace. But that intersection is not going

to help the usability and the desirability of that neighbor. I'm asking you if it can't be done, feasibly, economically. I'll have to live with it and I won't be your enemy. Like a smile every day. Just helping out do the best thing you can keep those trucks to go slow and idling. It still goes on; I hear them waiting to get into Perry Videx in the morning.

Wanted to consider putting some of those truck heaters and air conditioners like they have at truck stops as an alternative for people who come into the site and have to wait, when it's cold or it's hot. You know what I'm talking about? Right? Go to one of the truck stops down on 295 or the turnpike and you'll see the tractor trailers pulled up in line and hook these things to the window and the air conditioning to the cab without idling. It's very simple technology. It's a little heat pump device and a connector to the to the cab.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Let's get some clarification of one of your points. Is the speed bump that he's talking about coming out?

Mr. Conlon: Yes, and we will fix the potholes.

Mr. Pipes: That is a big help.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Closed public comment.

Ms. Kosko: We still have an outstanding developer's agreement. So, I do request that it is a condition of approval that we receive the developer's agreement.

Mr. Baranowski: We agree, I'm working with Mr. Gillespie and with Mr. Kingsbury on the legal documents that we need to do as any condition of the approval.

Ms. Kosko: You did provide us with the access agreement that was recently signed off on for the access easement last week. I don't know that all of those documents and all of our emails have been completely vetted by Mr. Gillespie or Mr. Kingsbury. So, just as Mr. Taylor had put in, number 10 on his most recent report, is a condition that all the Mary Way easements and agreement issues are satisfied as determined by the board professionals, as well as Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Baranowski: We agree.

Mr. Krollfeifer: Any other questions from the Board? If not, we need to take some action.

Mr. Kingsbury: They are seeking minor subdivision approval and preliminary and final site plan approval. That includes certain waivers, parking spaces, which we discussed waivers on building A regarding front loading, setback, backing into building A and buffering of lands of the loading zones, and a building B the number of front parking spaces and the front setback on those parking spaces. You can combine the motion as one if you would like to.

Mrs. Kelley motioned to combine the motion and grant approval.

Second: Mr. McKay

**Roll call:** Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mayor MacLachlan, yes;

Mrs. Gilmore, yes; Mr. Tricocci, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes;

Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve.

## 7. Minutes

### A. Meeting minutes of October 5, 2022

Mrs. Tiver: I was unable to complete the minutes for the October 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. They will be placed on the December 7 meeting.

## 8. Resolutions

### A. Resolution 2022-12: Granting Minor Subdivision Realignment of Block 42 Lots 1, 1.01, 1.03, 2, 2.01

Motion to approve: Mrs. Gilmore

Second: Ms. Kosko

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

Motion carries

## 9. Correspondence

### A. Letter dated October 3, 2022 from Alaimo Engineers to Mr. Krollfeifer Re: Davenport Village Expansion Block 9.01 Lot 42 Compliance Review

### B. Letter dated October 19, 2022 from Alaimo Engineers to Ms. Kosko Re: Davenport Village Expansion Block 9.01 Lot 42

Motion to accept and file: Mrs. Kelley

Second: Mrs. Tyndale

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

## 10. Professional Comments – None

## 11. Board Comments -None

## 11. Public Comments

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

## 13. Adjournment

Mrs. Gilmore motioned to adjourn at 11:45pm

Second: Ms. Kosko

**Roll call:** All in favor.

---

Paula L. Tiver, Secretary