

WESTAMPTON TOWNSHIP LAND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Woodlane Logistics Special Meeting      October 25, 2022

MINUTES

The special meeting for Woodlane Logistics was held via the Zoom platform virtually on October 25, 2022 at 6:30 P.M. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gary Borger and the opening statement required by Sunshine Law was read. This meeting was advertised in the Burlington County Times on October 13, 2022 on the Township website. All guests were welcomed.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

Present:                      Mr. Borger, Mr. Fagan, Mr. Grace, Mr. Guerrero, Mr. Holshue, Mr. Jones, Mr. Thorpe, Ms. Tolor  
                                      (came late)  
Absent:                      Mr. Carr, Mr. Henley, Mr. Oddenheimer  
Professional Staff:      Attorney Nicholas Sullivan, Engineer Michael Roberts, Planner Chris Dochney, Secretary Jodie  
Termi

---

**SWEAR IN PROFESSIONALS:**

Mr. Cappelli swore in Planner Chris Dochney and Engineer Michael Roberts

**MINUTES:**

October 5, 2022 - Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve Mr. Holshue, Mr. Jones second. None opposed. Mr. Borger, Mr. Grace, Mr. Thorpe abstained.

**RESOLUTION(S):**

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Woodlane Logistics, LLC, Block: 804 Lot: 12 (Irick & Woodlane Road), "d" Use Variance, Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval. Construction of 2 warehouse/distribution facilities, building 1 approximately 307,520 square feet and building 2 approximately 205,140 square feet)

Michael Floyd (Mr. Floyd) – I'm an attorney with Archer and Greiner appearing on behalf of the applicant Woodlane logistics LLC, which has submitted an application for preliminary and final site plan approval, bulk variance approval and use variance approval for property located along Irick Road County Route 630, Woodlane Road County Route 630 and the New Jersey Turnpike and identified as you just heard is Block 804 Lot 12 on the townships official tax map. This application involves the proposed development and use of two warehouse distribution facilities. Building number one will be approximately 307,520 square feet in size. Building number two will be approximately 205,140 square feet in size, all with related site improvements that are typical to a two building Industrial Park including landscaping, lighting, stormwater management and related site improvements. The property is in the industrial zoning district, and the property is currently farmed. It has been historically farmed, and since a use variance approval was granted in 1997. There has also been a cell phone tower on the property that accommodates approximately 900 square feet pursuant to a ground lease. So again, that cell phone tower accommodates less than 1/10 of 1% of the overall track, which currently

99.9% approximately is farmed. The relief that we are seeking this evening is preliminary and final site plan approval to allow the two-building industrial park along with bulk variances and we're also seeking use variance approval to allow the cellular communications tower to remain on the property where it is. We're not proposing any changes to the cell phone tower in terms of the ground lease area the height of the tower, or any other proposed modifications. With me this evening we do have two fact witnesses and several expert witnesses. Our first witness is going to be Mr. Dan Hudson (Mr. Hudson) on behalf of the applicant. Dan will speak to the applicant and its experience with industrial development, the anticipated tenants in this building and related operational issues. Our second fact witness will be John Pew, III (Mr. Pew). Mr. Pew is the co-executor of the estate of John Pew, Jr. The estate is the owner of the property the applicant is the contract purchaser and Mr. Pew will be speaking to the historical use of the property and some of the prior approvals with the property. After Mr. Pews testimony, we will dive into the expert testimony. Our third witness will be Christian Roche (Mr. Roche), a licensed professional engineer with mining and engineering and environmental services and Chris is the engineer of record for this project. Our fourth witness will be Dan Desario (Mr. Desario), licensed professional engineer with Langan Engineering and Dan is our traffic expert for the project. Our fifth witness will be Scott Daniel (Mr. Daniel) is a licensed architect with Macomb and Scott will walk us through the architectural floor plans and elevations for these two buildings. Our sixth and last witnesses is Greg Woodruff (Mr. Woodruff), a licensed professional planner with his AICT designation, also with Langan Engineering, and Greg will be putting testimony on the record regarding the requested use variance approval and bulk variance approvals. Mr. Chairman, we are going to be presenting 10 exhibits this evening, and we will run through them and add them entered into the record. If there's no other issues now, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that we bring forward fourth our first witness

Mr. Sullivan swears in Dan Hudson

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Hudson – Can you describe your experience with the applicant and MRP Industrial which controls this special purpose entity that was set up as the applicant for this project.

Mr. Hudson states - I'm a principal in the firm MRP Industrial, we are an industrial developer. My background is such that I've been working on industrial real estate for the past 36 years. About 10 years ago I started MRP Industrial and in the last nine plus we have constructed roughly 54 warehouses, accommodating about 24 million square feet that span from Virginia to New Jersey. The bulk of our activity has been in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. We probably have worked on a dozen or so buildings in Burlington County in the last decade.

Mr. Floyd states - In terms of the property in question, can you just talk about why it's particularly well suited for Industrial development and why you would like to develop this property with the two-building industrial project?

Mr. Hudson states – There are two criteria that drive our activities. The first is location and the second is zoning. What attracted us to this property in the first place was that it's industrially zoned, and our intended use is a buy right use. With that criterion in mind, that's what got us interested in the property. The property is well located for what we do given its access to both the turnpike and 295. We also like the configuration of the real estate is not ideal for industrial from a geometric standpoint, in the sense that you wouldn't put one big building, but the two smaller, rear loaded buildings the 307 and 205. We would refer to those as small buildings in our business, but the smaller building footprint is a very much underserved segment of the central New Jersey marketplace. As a result, we're excited because of that, and because of the types of tenants that it would attract. The real estate market in New Jersey as you all know is very active tenant demand even in this most recent environment continues to outpace supply and the current vacancy rate is less than 2%. So, for all those reasons, Mike, it's a very attractive opportunity for us and our firm.

Mr. Floyd states – Can you explain to the Board how this is known as a speculative project or spec development as opposed to a build to suit and then considering that, what types of tenants and operations you might expect with the property based on your historical experience with not only industrial development but industrial development in South Jersey and in Westhampton.

Mr. Hudson states - Industrial tenants that would occupy buildings like this, they tend to be large sort of well-known companies, good credit, and solid job generators. The marketplace is such that almost everybody in my position because of the shortage of supply, builds what we call speculative buildings. It's very, very common practice. If you looked at all the buildings built in central New Jersey in the last five years, which counts for 31 or 32 buildings, 88% of them had been speculative buildings. So, what that means is we're building a building designing it with an intended user and type of intended user in mind, and it's the size and the configuration of the building that generally dictates the kinds of uses that end up in that building. So, this type of building which I referred to earlier, as sort of a smaller building probably goes to a multi-use, it could be a single tenant in each building, but in all likelihood, it may be two building two tenants per building. And those users tend to come from, you know, experience sort of coming out of the pandemic and the effort to solidify the supply chain. Those users tend to come from a group of industries, typically consumer goods, food, maybe traditional retailers, and logistics providers. If you look back that has accommodated for probably two thirds of all the leasing in those same user groups, two thirds of all the leasing activity in New Jersey in the last couple of years window. These are general warehousing type users, they probably utilize a single shift, they may use the second shift. They are not what you all might think of as fulfillment centers, or last mile facilities. That's a term those are two terms that people throw out there. Neither one of those kinds of uses would fit in these two buildings that we've designed.

Mr. Floyd states - In speaking of fulfillment centers. Can you go into some detail about your experience with fulfillment centers, but also your experience with traffic management plans and how you handle changes in traffic over time, especially in Burlington County.

Mr. Hudson states - Burlington County is unique. I think you are all aware of the implementation several years ago, probably two plus of the concept of a traffic management plan. I think that was put in place because there were a few Amazon fulfillment centers where people grossly represented the traffic, and that's both truck and employee traffic associated with those facilities. What the county did was they came in and they asked the group like us to put forth a traffic study. We do that. And then if the use that we put in the building ultimately does not match that plan, if it exceeds that plan, we're on the hook to fix the problem. And that is not an issue that anybody in my position would take lightly. I don't know if you understand how many of these projects get built but institutional real estate, life companies, insurance companies, pension funds, private equity firms, those are the people that partner with groups like me, and our partner in this case is a pension fund and the pension fund is represents public employees, teachers fire police the like that group of investor group is very risk averse. So, in a situation like this, we consider the TMP almost sacrosanct we would never violate the traffic accounts in one of these TMPs because what that in essence does is it opens me or the ownership group up to a contingent unquantifiable liability because we're on the hook to now fix the problem. So we would never violate a TMP and the TMP that is put forth here that our experts will dan in particular will talk about later, is really the Bible and the traffic that we will live by and we will lease the project by we had a scenario in the township recently, a couple of years, a year and a half ago, I think when we were signing the lease for Walmart, over 100 Western Drive. There was a concern about the counts because of the circumstance that I just described and so prior to entering that lease, we actually met with the county ran through the use, got everybody comfortable with the use and then entered into the lease agreement. So, we take this seriously and would never violate a TMP.

Mr. Floyd states – Can you talk briefly regarding the suitability of the site in terms of the regional road network and highway network, and where you anticipate most of the traffic will come from and what roads they'll use.

Mr. Hudson states - Basically, you've got three regional connections. I think everybody's aware of them they would be exit five on the New Jersey Turnpike and Exit 47 and 45 off Route 295. The site can be accessed via Woodlane, sort of full-service access, and it could be accessed, via Irick. But as you'll all learn, there was no ability to make a left turn off Irick. So that significantly limits any truck traffic from that direction. And then as we I think everybody is aware, along Irick from Rancocas is weight restricted so no trucks would come in that direction either.

Mr. Floyd states - You heard as part of the introduction, the reference to the existing cell tower on the property, based upon your experience with the property your due diligence as the contract purchaser, can you just speak about the cell phone tower and whether you feel it will pose any constraints or impediments to your proposed industrial development?

Mr. Hudson states – This cell phone tower is owned by American Tower. A cell tower acts kind of like a landlord for communications providers. So, they leased space on that tower to a whole bunch of user groups. In multiple conversations with American Tower who's aware of our activities here, they've never expressed any concern with our plans for the remainder of the property. I think as Mike stated, they occupy 900 total square feet, which is, you know, again, less than 1/10 of 1% or, you know, roughly 99.9% of the site is currently used for an approved use other than the cell tower, and that use as currently agricultural.

Mr. Floyd states - I guess the corresponding question would be, there hasn't been any historical problems between the agricultural use and the cell tower use. The cell tower company is not concerned with the industrial development. As the industrial developer do you have any concerns with the cell tower, its location on the property, and what impact it might have to your use and enjoyment of the property once developed?

Mr. Hudson states - We have no concerns and we obviously laid out our project with full knowledge that the cell tower existed.

Mr. Floyd states - Thank you, Dan. Is there anything else you'd like to state for the record and to the board?

Mr. Hudson states – No but thanks again for this opportunity this evening and we appreciate it very much.

Mr. Borger states – Are there any questions for Mr. Hudson by the Board?

Mr. Borger asks – The use of term logistic providers in addition to storing consumer goods and food items. What are logistic providers?

Mr. Hudson states – It's a term that's kind of come out of the pandemic a little bit because everybody needs to get their goods and services to the consumer. Some firms utilize third parties to do that and we generally refer to those as logistics providers or a common jargon might be a 3PL (third party logistics). But in the case of these buildings, they could be somebody that would operate a warehouse. We did one that was for North Face for example and that whole warehouse was operated by a 3PL, that was a 500,000 square foot building out in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. In this case, with a smaller footprint smaller use it's probably a firm that's going to represent retailers who needs somebody to move their goods, but combined they don't have enough mass per se, to occupy a building themselves. So they pool their use with a bunch of other retailers or folks selling or moving goods with a firm that can handle and accommodate that.

Mr. Borger asks – Is there any more questions from the Board?

Mr. Jones asks – This cell tower services this area and with this warehouse being set up and all the employees, assuming they will all have cell phones. Is that going to impact the cell phone tower service?

Mr. Hudson states – Not at all it happens all the time. Those folks probably have a cell phone that's run through that tower today if they're in the area. It's very common, as you'll hear later, this situation of cell phones proximate to other uses, like warehouse buildings occurs all the time.

Mr. Sullivan swears in the next witness – John Pew, III, the co-executor of the estate of John Pew, Jr.

Mr. Floyd asks - Would you please describe for the board your relationship to the property in question?

Mr. Pew states - I'm a co-executor of my father's estate.

Mr. Floyd asks - Are you familiar with the work and your ongoing farming operations at the property?

Mr. Pew states - Yes, very much.

Mr. Floyd asks - Are you aware of any past or present conflicts between the farming operations and the cell tower?

Mr. Pew states - No. In fact, a lot of time went into picking that spot with the township people, the cell tower owners and us to get an area that would not be affected by either our agriculture or their work on the cell tower. It fits in there perfectly.

Mr. Floyd asks - Just for the sake of clarity back in 1997, when the use variance approval was granted, was it your intention not to do anything to hinder the future development of the property?

Mr. Pew states – Yes, that's correct. We wouldn't have done it if we thought this would be a problem today.

Mr. Floyd asks - Did you ever approach the county about possibly preserving the land as farmland?

Mr. Pew states – Yes, it has always been our family's intent to sell the farm to the county, but when we approached them, they had no interest in doing it and then we put it on the market. We found something that was zoned for that area and that's what we went with.

Mr. Floyd asks - You are familiar with the application that's pending before the board this evening. Correct?

Mr. Pew states – Yes. I'm very familiar and I support the application 100%.

Mr. Floyd turns the meeting over to Mr. Borger.

Mr. Borger asks if the Board has any more questions? There are none and Mr. Floyd moves to his next witness.

Mr. Floyd states - Our next witness is Chris Roache, a licensed professional engineer with Langan Engineering and Environmental services. Chris is the project engineer of record for this application.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Mr. Roache

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache to put on the record, his education, his credentials, his experience, including testifying before boards as a licensed professional engineer.

Mr. Roache states - I've been practicing land development engineering in New Jersey now for approximately 17 years. I'm professionally licensed in the state. I've appeared before numerous boards across the state of New Jersey previously, I think I've been in front of this board approximately five times in the last five years. I have bachelor's degrees in civil engineering in business from Lehigh University, as well as a master's degree in civil engineering from North Carolina State. And last thing I'll say is all my licenses are active and current.

Mr. Borger states – Mr. Roache has presented the educational background and experience and licensure to allow him to appear before this board and will be accepted as an expert in the field of civil engineering.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache to share his screen to show exhibits that he will be testifying to. And before you begin, you're going to be presenting exhibits A1 first, which is an aerial photograph of the property and the surrounding uses. After that exhibit A2 which is a rendering of the site plan that was submitted to this board. Can we start with exhibit A1, and can you just describe the project site and the existing conditions?

Mr. Roche states - As was mentioned earlier this property is identified as Block: 804 Lot: 12 on the Westampton township tax map, it's approximately 43 acres and it's generally bound by Irick Road and Jersey Turnpike. West Woodlane Road and residential uses. South, BCIT the Burlington County Institute of Technology and other Burlington County uses to the East, and a tributary to Mill Creek to the North. The property presently is occupied mainly by

farmland. There is a small structure and the existing cell tower located in the western central portion of the site. As others have mentioned that cell tower lease area is approximately 900 square feet and that makes up 1/10 of percent of the total site area. Access to property is presently provided via an access point off of Irick Road and from topography perspective, the site generally slopes from the South down to the North and there is an approximate 40-foot grade changes everything drains towards the aforementioned tributary, There are wetlands and a flood hazard area associated with that tributary the extents of these constraints have previously been confirmed by the NJDEP. Typically, we obtained a flood hazard area verification as well as a letter of interpretation from the NJDEP in May of 2021. The last thing I'll touch on is this exhibit Mr. Floyd is that the entirety of the property is in the industrial zone where warehouses that are permitted.

Mr. Floyd states - Thank you. Can we move to exhibit A2 to the rendering of the site plan. Can you describe the proposed development and the layout for everyone.

Mr. Roche states - What the applicant is proposing to construct on site are two warehouse buildings totaling 512,660 square feet, with associated loading and parking areas. Warehouse building one proposing a northern portion of the site will have a footprint of approximately 307,520 square feet that will be accompanied by 53 loading docks and 45 trailer parking stalls. 288 auto parking spots. Warehouse number two proposing the southern portion of the site will have a footprint of 205,240 square feet 39 loading docks as well as 215 car parking stalls. Although, the way the site's been laid out, the proposed loading areas will be located on the eastern portion of the site, whereas the auto parking will be located on the western portion of the site, as well as a small parking area to the south of building two. I did mention the total building square footage to break that down a little bit further. Oppose building one with the overall footprint of 307,520 square feet of that 28,800 square feet will be for Office purposes and the remaining 278,720 square feet will be utilized for warehouse. Proposed building two with the overall footprint of 205,240 square feet will have 20,400 square feet of office but the remaining 184,740 square feet can be utilized as warehouse. From a site access perspective, we are proposing to site access points we have a full movement Access Point proposed along Woodlane Road as well as a right in right out left out access point on Irick Road. I'll note that both roads and access points are under county jurisdiction and our traffic engineer will talk much more about these access points later on in the presentation.

Mr. Floyd states - Can you speak to the parking and loading requirements and whether the site plans as presented meet those requirements?

Mr. Roache states - From an overall parking perspective ordinance requires one parking stall for 5000 square feet of warehouse space and one parking stall with 250 square feet of office space using the aforementioned numbers. I stated from a square footage perspective running the calculations we'd be required to have 291 parking spaces and we're proposing 503 parking. We do have eight ADA parking stalls proposed with building one as well as seven ADA parking stall with building two that's a total of 15 Ada parking stalls whereas we're required to have 14 parking stalls. From a dimensional perspective the vast majority of the proposed parking stalls will be nine feet wide by 18 feet deep with 25-foot-wide drive aisles. We do have two areas where we've been proposing visitor parking stalls. There'll be to the west of building one and for the South building to building one will have a total of 14 visitor parking stalls and building two will have a total of 10 visitor parking stalls. The only difference with the visitor parking stalls is a slight change in the stall dimension. Rather than being nine feet by 18 feet the stalls are 10 feet by 20 feet. We also mentioned loading, the load requirement is one loading stall per 8000 square feet of warehouse use. Again, running numbers would be required to have 59 loading stalls whereas 92 voting stalls aren't proposed meeting the threshold. I'll not to relative to the proposed trailer parking to the north of building one, we do have 45 trailer parking stalls and we will be conforming there's a requirement in the ordinance that these trailers can't be parked for a duration longer than 15 days, and we're fully willing to agree to that requirement.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache to speak about how trash is going to be handled on the site and recycling areas?

Mr. Roache states - Trash operations is really determined by the entity of tenants. So, what we've shown conceptually are two exterior trash locations, both located on the northeast corner of each building. If the yet to be selected tenant does want to utilize these exterior trash locations. They'll be screened in accordance with ordinance requirements. Presently, we're showing some landscape screening. But if we were to move forward, we would also have enclosures and gates around structures to provide the necessary screening. I would suggest that we would work this out with the township planner as part of any type of conditions moving forward.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache to describe the overall stormwater management system and the proposed improvements and also confirm whether it meets the current NJDEP applicable requirements and regulations?

Mr. Roache states – The stormwater management design has been performed to meet the latest state requirements are called the new storm water requirements which were fully put in place in 2021. Relative to where quantity water quality and groundwater recharge. We are not only meeting these requirements, but in many instances were really exceeding the requirements and we're doing so through the proposed construction of an infiltration basin in the southern portion of the wetland in northern portion of the site and in several bio retention basins along the sites perimeter relative to water quantity the state as well as the township requires that we reduce peak flows compared to existing conditions. So, for each storm event there's certain criteria we followed a two-year storm event required to have a 50% reduction in peak flows. We're proposing an 80% reduction in peak flows. With 10 year, storm event we're required to have a 25% reduction, and again we're proposing close to an 80% reduction. Lastly with 100-year storm event a 20% reduction is required in those peak flows and we're proposing a 70% reduction. So, we're greatly exceeding requirements. We're quantity perspective. We're quality perspective and groundwater recharge perspective. Those requirements are being met through the proposed construction of the bioretention basins mainly located around the site perimeter, as well as within some parking lot landscape islands.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roach to talk about the proposed-on site utilities.

Mr. Roache states – Sewer is going to be provided by the Mount Holly MUA via a gravity system on our site and also a pump station. We'll be using a fork to connect to the existing Mount Holly MUA system within main road. From a water perspective, we've been coordinating a design with New Jersey American Water there's an existing line in Woodland Road. We'll be extending that down Irick an eight-inch main and that will loop throughout our site. We are proposing a fire tank. That fire tank is located outside of the front yard setback, but we will be requesting a design waiver for this because it is located between the principal building and the nearest public right away. More about that as we get into the design waivers later this evening. I'll also state that that tank is being designed by our fire protection engineer and will be approximately 25 to 30 feet tall. Lastly on utilities electric and gas provided by PSE&G, and we will serve letters from both of those entities.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache - With respect to landscaping we are proposing an enormous number of new trees and shrubs. Can you walk us through the proposed landscaping and then also the proposed lighting at the site?

Mr. Roache states - We're proposing 652 new trees along with 869 new shrubs the landscaping designs really focused along the site perimeter as well as within the landscape islands of the parking areas out of those 652 trees 358 evergreen trees 95 will be ornamental trees and 199 will be shade trees. Although we did receive comments from the Township's landscape professionals, through CME letters, and we have no objection to complying with those landscape related to the site lighting. We are proposing 35 new light poles along with 32 building mountain fixtures all these fixtures will be new LED fixtures and the lighting temperature of 3000 Kelvin. They'll be 25 foot high relative to the mounting heights and they have been designed to meet the ordinance requirements relative to minimum lighting levels. We are requesting to exceed the maximum lighting level. Typically, we have average lighting levels above 0.5 Foot Candles and the reason for that is safety purposes. What we're proposing is generally in line with industry standard and that's another waiver that I will talk about in a few minutes here.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache – Are there any new signage proposed with this application?

Mr. Roache states - We conceptually showed monument signs on the site plans are what I'll state with something conceptual because the ultimate signage will be dictated by the yet be selected tenant for what we're showing on the application now if we are conforming the signage ordinances for West Hampton Township, if for some reason a tenant were to come back and want to exceed certain standards, he would bring us back to the board at that time.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache - Can you just walk the board through briefly the various variances and design waivers that we are requesting.

Mr. Roache states - We are seeking a use variance specifically we're asking that the cell tower be allowed to remain after potential construction of the permitted warehouse use. We're requesting relief from ordinance section 250-22a(1) this is in regard to the water tank which I mentioned earlier. Specifically, we're seeking relief to have this in the front yard area between warehouse building one road and Irick Road. The proposed tank is located outside the front yard setback is still just located between the building and the roadway, hence the need for the relief. We are requesting some relief from ordinance section 250-22b(2) as well relative to restricts while we're providing the required buffer strips there are some restrictions on what can go within these buffer strips. The ordinance states that the buffers be free from structures accessory building signs, driveways, parking areas, outdoors storage areas, recreation facilities or other active uses. We do have two driveways through buffers as necessary to connect the public roadways. We have some directional signage although it's limited along Irick Road and Woodlane Road. Lastly, we do have some retaining walls along the site's Eastern property line. I should state though from a visual perspective we will be seeing the wall. From a lighting perspective, we are asking for a deviation for more protection to 250-22b. The ordinance requires a maximum average lighting levels 0.5 Foot Candles we're proposing an average level of around 1.7-to-2.7-foot candles. What we're proposing is generally in line with industry standards and commonly what we use on proposed warehouse applications. There was a potential waiver noted for landscape Island sizes. It was ordinance Section 196-8c(1) which requires that the end of each parking row have a landscape island with a footprint of 200 square feet. We made sure that 200 square feet at some locations we're very close. We're going to eliminate the need for this design waiver. We are working with our professional to increase the island necessary to provide that required 200 square foot. Lastly, there was a comment relative to Ordinance section 196-8c(4) which talks about the potential for the board to request berms in areas where parking is located in the front yard. We do have berms proposed on site specifically along Woodlane Road embankment for the basin is typically three to six feet higher than roadway elevations and also have plantings in that area. We've added some small berm areas along Irick Road where feasible with a border of three feet high.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache – Have you had a chance to review the latest technical review letters issued by the Board Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Roache states – Yes.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Roache - Do you have any issues revising the site plans to comply with their technical review comments?

Mr. Roache states - I have no objection to fully complying with their requests.

Mr. Floyd turns the meeting over to Mr. Borger.

Mr. Borger asks the Board if they have any questions?

Mr. Grace states - My specific concerns regarding this matter are environmental considerations, considering the proximity to schools, residential areas, and agricultural areas. Could you speak a little bit to the impact this proposed development will have on woodland, streams, wetlands, floodplains, and groundwater impact?



Mr. Roache states - I'll touch upon the items I think I'm qualified to touch upon some other items may be better addressed by our witnesses later in the evening. But starting out specifically with the overall floodplain and wetland areas, associated with the tributary Mill Creek in the northern portion. The way we did the site design was to limit any intrusion or site activities of the restricted areas. When we went through the process, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, they identified and agreed with constrained areas and negotiated buffers and we're staying outside of these sensitive areas meaning we're not putting any type of structures any type of pavement any type of land disturbance within the highly sensitive areas. I'll also note that we did go through a screening with the US Department of Fish and Wildlife. There was concerns potentially about any threatened or endangered species, bog turtle and we did receive a letter back from US Fish and Wildlife, that they agreed with our conclusions that the project would have no impact on a potential threatened and endangered species.

Mr. Borger asks if the Board has any more questions. None.

Mr. Floyd states - Our next witness is Dan Desario (Mr. Desario).

Mr. Sullivan swears in Mr. Desario.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Desario to state his education and experience, and credentials for the record.

Mr. Desario states - I have a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from Temple University. I have Master of Science in Transportation Engineering from New Jersey Institute of Technology. I'm a licensed professional engineer in New Jersey as well as several other states. I'm also a certified professional Traffic Operations Engineer, PTOE, which is the common abbreviation for that certification that is also by examination like the PE I've been accepted as a witness in the field of traffic engineering before hundreds of boards throughout New Jersey, and specifically in Burlington County as well as this board. I've worked on hundreds of millions of square feet of warehousing development across the USA.

Mr. Borger states - Based on Mr. Desario's educational background, his achievements, his licensure, and his experience, that he's testified to, he has the right to present expert testimony. He is qualified as an expert to testify about traffic engineering, and to render opinions in that area.

Mr. Floyd states Mr. Desario - You've heard testimony from Dan Hudson and John Pew about the existing conditions on the property the proposed conditions and expert engineering testimony from your colleague, Chris Roache, regarding this proposed two building industrial park. Can you start by talking about your experience with the project, your site visits and what studies and counts were done from a traffic perspective?

Mr. Desario states - As the board hopefully is aware we've prepared a traffic study entitled traffic impact study for woodland logistics, dated April 4, 2022. That was part of the site plan application submission package that report details, very extensive studies that we've conducted relative to the proposed development that's before you this evening. And the conclusion of that report is that the proposed site driveways both along Irick Road as well as a Woodlane Road will operate safely and efficiently. I will take you through some of the specifics of that traffic study. I do not intend to cover in verbal testimony every aspect, but I will cover the highlights for you this evening and I will be happy to answer any specific questions that you do have. To establish baseline traffic conditions, we have previously done extensive traffic counts throughout 2021 during the pandemic, we also research historical traffic data in and around the surrounding area of the site. However, for this specific study, we elected to do updated traffic counts, and they were conducted on Tuesday, September 21, 2021. When school was back in regular session, those counts were conducted from the hours of 6am to 7pm on that day. They captured all the school dismissal and arrival activity and when I refer to the school, I mean the Burlington County institute of technology or BCIT which is directly adjacent to the property. Those counts were conducted at the Irick Road intersections with Woodlane both on the east side of the turnpike, as well as on the west side of the turnpike. And we also did traffic counts at the BCIT's driveway as well along Woodlane Road as part of that counting effort. We identified the highest volumes that occurred at those two intersections on the east side and west

side of the turnpike. And they generally occurred from 7:30am to 8:30am in the morning, and then again from about 2:45pm to 4:15pm depending on which of those intersections you wanted to look at during the evening. Their highest volumes occur at different times from each other. That's why I'm bracketing it between 2:45pm and 4:15pm depending on which intersection you look at. So those peak hour volumes have captured and do represent when the school is having its highest activity during arrival time in the morning as well as dismissal time in the afternoon. We established those existing peak hour traffic volumes which are detailed in the traffic study to establish baseline conditions. We then applied a background traffic growth rate to increase those volumes to future conditions. That growth rate is one and a half percent, which is a published growth rate by the New Jersey Department of Transportation for purposes of conducting traffic studies. We also identified several other area developments, all of which were along the Route 541 corridor, and we accounted for their traffic as well. So, we took the existing peak hour traffic volumes we expanded them to account for background traffic growth and then we added specific other area development traffic as well to establish the future no build traffic volumes. So, at that point in our analysis, we needed to identify how much traffic this specific development that's before you would generate. Now all traffic engineers rely on a publication which is entitled trip generation. It's published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and it's currently in its 11th edition. We elected to use the 10th edition and I will explain the reason for that shortly. Looking at the 10th edition, trip generation manual, you use the trip rates for the land use code 150 which is for warehousing which is what is proposed as part of this development. Now if you look at the 10th edition trip rates for warehousing and you compare them to the 11th edition, trip rates for warehousing, the 11th edition trip rates are lower than those in the 10th edition. So, we elected to be conservative and use the 10th edition trip rates for warehousing to estimate how much traffic this proposed development would generate. Based on those 10th edition trip rates, the proposed development would generate during a morning peak hour for cars 62 cars coming in 19 cars exiting for a total two-way car volume of 81. For trucks 11 trucks would enter 21 would exit for a total two-way trucking with 32. If you had those numbers up for a morning peak hour, that would equate to 73 vehicles entering and 40 vehicles exiting for total two-way vehicular volume of 113 to be generated by this proposed development. Similarly, for a weekday evening peak hour, 14 cars would come in 78 would exit for total two-way car volume of 92. For trucks 16 would enter and 15 trucks would exit for total two-way truck volume is 31. And if you add those numbers up for total vehicles 30 would enter 93 would exit for a total vehicular two-way volume of 123 during a weekday evening peak hour. Those trip rates are based on when a typical warehouse development would generate its highest hourly traffic. Typically warehouses have operations that are outside the normal peak commute times on adjacent streets. So, we elected to use those trip rates even though this warehouse development is likely to generate lower traffic volumes. Then when the traffic on the adjacent streets is at its highest, but we elected to use the street peak hour volumes that we identified from the accounts and the peak hour of generated trip rates for warehouses and those estimates, and we added those together to come up with a conservative estimation of future build traffic volumes with which to conduct our analysis of traffic operations. I will point out at this point that the trip generation that we've identified, as Mr. Hudson testified to earlier will be subject and part and partial to a traffic management plan or a TMP that the County will require as part of their site plan approval for this development. What that means is that we as the applicants' consultants and the applicant as the entity that's going to seek approval and develop this project are bound to those numbers that we've estimated. If the applicant finds a tenant that wishes to generate more traffic than those estimates, than the traffic study suggests than we must go back to the County for a reevaluation of whatever numbers a specific tenant would generate. And if it's concluded that additional traffic impact would be experienced with higher numbers. Then the county is going to require a mitigation of that additional traffic. I will submit to you respectfully that a two-way volume of 113 in the morning and 123 in the evening are not significant. And the reason why I submitted that to you respectfully, again, is that most jurisdictions entities including the New Jersey Department of Transportation, do not consider land uses that generate 100 or less peak hour trips to be significant traffic generators. Now I know these numbers are slightly higher than then 100 trip thresholds, but I would respectfully submit to you that those slight increased numbers do not amount to a significant traffic generator or will have significant traffic impacts in terms of the surrounding roadways and intersections. So, we've established the

existing and future traffic volumes. We've identified based on published trip rates that all traffic engineers use, how much traffic we estimate for this development to generate. Now we must take that traffic and distribute along the adjacent roadway network in terms of cars and trucks. For the car portion of that traffic generation we built what's known as a journey to work model which basically looked at census data for workers that work in this specific area of Westampton and identified where they live based on the journey to work census data that the federal government publishes and based on information in round numbers, we would expect the car traffic of this proposed development to be distributed about 25% to and from the east along Woodland Road, heading towards the 541 corridor. About 50% to and from the south along Irick Road, and then the balanced about 25% heading to the north, along Irick Road on the west side of the turnpike. For truck traffic we basically distributed the truck traffic knowing as Mr. Hudson had indicated the major routes that trucks would be destined to, most specifically the 295 corridors as well as the New Jersey Turnpike. For trucks, we would anticipate about again round numbers to and from the east along Woodlane Road about 50% of the trucks would use that direction of approach to get to the site. Irick Road to and from the north about 25% and then Woodlane Road to the south about 25%, again that portion of Woodlane Road would be on the west side of the Turnpike. So if you apply those trip percentages or distribution percentages to the traffic that we estimated and you apply that to the intersections that we are studying. What that comes down to is that along any of the roads that surround the site, whether it's Woodlane to the east of the Turnpike, or IRIC road to the west of the Turnpike in no instance to most roads see increases that amount to effectively less than one new vehicle every two minutes during peak hours. As an example if you were to go out and look at Woodlane Road to and from the east of the site, so heading from 541 towards this site, if you were to go out there and look at Woodlane Road today, and then if the board and were inclined to grant approval and the project was built and you were to go and look at Woodlane Road that section again in the future with the development in place. You would not see more than one additional vehicle every two minutes either coming from 541 towards the site or leaving the site and heading back to 541. I would again respectfully submit to this board. That level of traffic increase is not significant, and it will be hard to discern a noticeable difference in traffic operations along the surrounding roads. If indeed this development is approved and constructed. The site traffic to the future volumes that we identified that I talked to about a little while ago, to come up with the future volumes we then analyzed the proposed driveways both along Irick as well as Woodlane. You heard from Mr. Roache that the driveway that's proposed along Irick will allow all movements into and out of the site other than the left turns into the site so the Irick Road driveway will not allow turns in and the driveway that's proposed along Woodlane will allow all movements both left turns and right turns into and out of the site. Traffic engineers use what's called the highway capacity manual to conduct an analysis of traffic operations for intersections, freeways, ramp junctions, stopped controlled intersections, traffic signalized intersections, that is the underlying methodology that is used as set forth by the Highway Capacity Manual. We use software in this case is Pro software which employs those methodologies. Based on running our analysis, we've concluded that the site driveways that are proposed will operate at acceptable operations, and they will operate both in a safe and efficient manner. We looked at several design publications when we were evaluating the driveway locations, including the county's design standards. The New Jersey Department of Transportation, even though these aren't state highways, but we nonetheless looked at their standards. We looked at what's known as the Green Book, which is the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. We also looked at the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Based on review of all those documents. We are confident that the driveways as proposed on the site plan meet all applicable design standards with respect to driveway locations along adjacent roadways and will provide adequate sight lines as well as sight distances which are also important elements when you are evaluating the location of driveways and with our review and the design is set forth in the site plan set that's before you. I respectfully submit to this board that the site driveways have been designed and are located properly and again will operate efficiently based on the analysis that we've conducted. And I see no issues with the site access as currently proposed. Now, the applicant with the analysis that we've put together, as well as previous conversations with the county relative to this site, has elected to put forth improvements which are and can be considered off-site improvements as part of his application, and I will list those for you now. This first notable

improvement is the applicant is committed to installing a traffic signal and again this is all subject to county review and approval because the adjacent roadways are all under county jurisdiction. But the applicant is committed to installing a traffic signal at the West intersection so west of the Turnpike of Irick Road and Woodlane Road. The applicant is also committed to making improvements along Irick Road where it has the horizontal curve to head towards the Turnpike, essentially where the site driveways proposed along Irick Road. Those improvements consist of maintaining at least an 18-foot-wide pavement width for the direction of coming from the turnpike heading towards the site. Apparently, with current conditions, although I know the Turnpike just completed its upgrade project if you will, relative to their bridge that they have over the Turnpike, but along Woodlane so there's been additional pavement, but the applicant remains committed to ensuring that there's at least 18 foot width of pavement. Heading from the turnpike towards the site to address the potential of trucks either driving over into the grass area or not having enough width as two vehicles are passing each other in opposite directions. In addition, the applicant is committed to installing additional curve warning signage. Right now, there is signage and it's commonly referred to as chevron signs. Those are the signs that are white background with black arrows, and they help guide you as you come around a horizontal curve. The applicant is committed to providing additional and supplemental chevron signs consistent with current standards in both directions to warn motorists of that curve. Regardless of what direction they're coming in or going to. Finally, the applicant remains committed to making improvements to the existing signalized intersection of Irick Road and Woodlane Road. So, the intersection on the east side of the Turnpike, which consists of upgrading some of the signal equipment and modifying some of the operation to improve the efficiency of that intersection. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions the Board may have.

Mr. Borger asks if anyone has any questions for Mr. Desario.

Mr. Fagan asks - On the west side of Irick and Woodlane Road, trucks making a right-hand turn. Is there some kind of information as far as the angle at which they're turning? Are they able to even make that turn without touching on to the other side? It's problematic for trucks making that right hand turn as it is currently.

Mr. Borger asks Mr. Desario to share exhibit A2 an aerial view of the proposed property.

Mr. Desario states - The intersection that the question centers around is down towards the lower side of that exhibit. The cursor just had encircled that intersection. You're correct in terms of the existing stop-controlled intersection today. A truck that is coming down Irick towards woodlane and wants to make a right turn. That turn is tight, and it requires a truck to encroach over the center line as they're making that right turn. As I indicated, the applicant is committed to installing a traffic signal at an intersection and as part of installing the traffic signal. We would do an evaluation of where the stop lines need to be located along Irick and Woodlane. So that trucks and appropriate design vehicles can make those turns without encroaching over those center lines. So that is an excellent question and one that quite frankly, we would address as part of designing a signal for that intersection.

Mr. Fagan states - Okay, thank you. Considering that the site is very close to residential properties and the school, of course, is there any consideration for air quality impact with the additional trucks and vehicles that would be coming due to the site?

Mr. Floyd states – There are no immediate concerns regarding air quality the Master Plan and the zoning board has had this property zoned for decades as industrial knowing what the surrounding areas are. And obviously the use and enjoyment of the property for industrial purposes is going to be subject to all federal and state standards regarding air quality.

Mr. Borger asks if any other Board members have any questions?

Dave Guerrero states - There's a comment in the report from our engineer under traffic regarding jurisdiction lines. I know what code you are using but I'm not sure in the 11th edition, whether there's anything in there for fulfillment

centers, and oh there is for hiking fulfillment centers in the 10th edition and that number is probably seven, eight times greater than the general warehousing number. Considering that you don't have a specific use for the warehouse, this warehouse could potentially be used as a fulfillment center type of distribution center.

Mr. Desario states - You're correct there is a fulfillment center land use category, both in 11th and as well as 10th edition. You heard from the Mr. Hudson, as these buildings are not suited for a fulfillment center type operation. Full disclosure and I appeared before your board before I do a lot of work with Amazon. So, Amazon's often associated fulfillment center and rightly so. I can tell you that Amazon wouldn't do a deal here because the buildings are too small and there's not enough car parking or trailer parking. So, this site, and the spec buildings are not suited for a fulfillment center, and it would not be appropriate to use a fulfillment center land use to estimate how much traffic this development would generate. When we get to the next witness, Mr. Guerrero, I would have some time to go and look at the definition of the fulfillment center and trip generation manual and see what the building sizes are just going from memory, my guts telling me that the footprints of those buildings that comprise the fulfillment center, land use and what the data is based on are probably in excess of 800,000 square feet footprints, which neither of these buildings are. There's a trip generation hammer that if this applicant wants to exceed those numbers, we must go back to the county and we have to go back to the county to discuss specifically what the numbers would be for specific tenants' operation. Knowing Mr. Hudson as well as I do, it's in his best interest to find tenants that are consistent with the numbers that I've testified to and that will be part of the TMP because it just makes it a lot easier to occupy these buildings.

Mr. Borger asks if any other Board members have any more questions?

Mr. Thorpe states – In your conclusions and I will just read it out loud. Widen Irick Road to provide an 18-foot car way on the inside of the roads horizontal curve to the east of the turnpike overpass as long as accommodated by the existing right away. So, the 18-foot car way is where's that measured from?

Mr. Desario states - It's from the painted center line to the edge of pavement.

Mr. Borger asks Mr. Desario - Would that be nine feet on each side or 18 feet on each side?

Mr. Desario states - It's 18 feet on the inside of the curve. So, when you're driving from the turnpike to the site. It's the inside of the curve when you're making that right hand turn.

Mr. Dochney states –You mentioned it's been brought up several times with this traffic management plan that it must get approved by the county. You had mentioned that there is if in the instance in the future, let's say this gets approved, you identify tenants, somebody moves in and there's a post occupancy study done, and your traffic is exceeding the volumes that you had projected what measures would the county potentially take? I know obviously, you're not representing Burlington County just the applicant here tonight. But maybe in your experience, there has been a situation where this has occurred. What mitigation measures would the County enforce? Specifically say your traffic is too much and you must reduce your traffic volumes? You can't accept more deliveries. You can't hire more people. Or is it mitigation in terms of additional geometric elements to the roadway or technological improvements like retiming traffic signals or something like that? Just curious what when you say mitigation, what does that mean in these circumstances if the traffic volumes were to exceed the projections?

Mr. Desario states - I just want to offer to you that most of the TMPs I've seen coming out of Burlington County require either the applicant or the developer if they're not one in the same entity to go to the county prior to a tenant occupy to review what that specific tenant's operation is in terms of their shift times number of employees per shift and their projected truck volumes. So, if there is an issue at that very early stage, there could be a collaborative discussion how to address it in terms of you want to generate more traffic than what you're approved for. Okay. We need to peel that back and really understand it and then we'll tell you what we want. Some of the things that I've seen could consist of requiring the specific tenant to change their operation, so let's say they had 200 people coming in on a shift all at once,

they may have to stagger that so that only 100 come in at a certain hour and another 100 come in a subsequent hour as an example. It could also consist of the county, as you suggested, requiring additional improvements beyond those that this applicant as committed to for this specific project.

Mr. Hudson states - Traffic is always a concern and you could argue that why would I under shoot my traffic? Well, because I had intense use that I want to put in later, the traffic count ended that opportunity and they ultimately, I called it an unquantifiable contingent liability. If I were to do that, and I'd had to mitigate the cost of that mitigation is on the property owner. So that is an enormous hammer. And if I don't do it, they could deem it a change in use and shut down the building. So, my comment and testimony earlier were we're never going to violate it. I think Mr. Guerrero made the comment. What if a fulfillment center went in with seven times the traffic? That's a theoretical possibility, but it will never happen in one of our buildings, as evidenced by our behavior, most recently with Walmart and just for giggles, we went and actually wanted to test this scientifically on the two buildings we just finished in Mansfield, and we found out that our traffic for the in place tenants was 26% of the approved traffic volume at that facility, which if you all know, was a was an arduous process for the landowner to get approved. So, we had a traffic limitation in counts and the current traffic there's 26% of what was approved. So, if I violate it, the county has the ultimate hammer that would cost me money or shut down my building, neither of which is tenable. Therefore, we simply won't do it.

Mr. Desario states - We have overestimated how much traffic this one's going to generate. And by using the in a couple of ways, one by using the land use code 150 warehousing those trip rates. That land code really represents more traditional, if you will, warehouses, warehouses that don't have a lot of automation inside them, and they rely more on human labor to run them. What the applicants are proposing to build our new modern warehouses that will have likely a high level of mechanization modernization and automation, where the reliance on human labor is not as much as we have modeled by using the 150 warehousing trip rates. The other thing is, I mentioned is we're using the trip rates that represent when a warehouse generates its highest traffic volumes, which is not necessarily in most senses occurring while any of us are commuting to work if you commute to work between seven to nine in the morning. Most warehouses generate their highest morning volumes before 7am. But we've elected to use what the warehouse will generate and assume that it occurs at the same time. Most warehouses today that have occupied, or I should say most tenants that have occupied most of the warehousing that's been built in New Jersey for the last 15 or 20 years or more in line with what's known as high cube warehouses. High cube warehouses are very modern, automated and rely a lot on human labor, and they tend to generate less traffic than a traditional warehouse. As Mr. Hudson had said, we've been testing actual warehouses to see what they generate versus what the published trip rate would otherwise suggest. And the one he referenced the Mansfield on yours truly is the one that went out and had the traffic counts done. And Dan, just for everyone's edification, I believe those buildings are a lot bigger than the ones that we are proposing at this site, and even the bigger buildings proved to generate only a fraction of the traffic that was otherwise estimated using the published trip rates. I can tell you; I've consistently found that with other warehouses that are fully occupied. A lot of them are up in Cranberry around 8a. We've had the opportunity to do follow up traffic counts and consistently they generate less traffic than what we estimated.

Mr. Borger asks if any other Board members have any questions.

Mr. Roberts states – Can you give us an update on the application with the County?

Mr. Floyd states - We have an application that's been submitted. It's pending with the Burlington County Board Planning Board, and we have expressed to the County Planning Board the same testimony we put forward this evening about our commitment the applicants commitment to install the traffic signal and other roadway improvements.

Mr. Roberts states – The improvements that the county has in front of them, do they include the improvements to the traffic intersection, traffic light at the intersection.

Mr. Desario states - The County doesn't have the design drawings. They do know that the applicant is willing to install a traffic signal at that West intersection.

Mr. Roberts states - If they find it that it's necessary, then we'll move forward with the traffic right at that location.

Mr. Floyd states - Correct. It's jurisdiction of the county, but we have made clear in our application materials, as well as in communications with the Deanna Drum and others at the county that the applicant is 100% committed to the installation of the signal and the other proposed road improvements that we've discussed this evening.

Mr. Robert states - So the timing of that would work out that the construction of the intersection would occur simultaneously with the construction of the property, should it move forward?

Mr. Desario states - Presumably, yes. And I would even say that I believe that the County would require the signal to be fully installed and operating before the warehouses can open.

Mr. Borger asks Mr. Desario – What has your experience been with other prior projects that would require County Road work. In conjunction with the development of the site.

Mr. Desario states - They want to see all the improvements in place before they allow the buildings to open.

Mr. Borger asks if there are any other questions from board members or our professionals?

Mr. Thorpe states- I just want to make sure we are on the same page. In your conclusions you have four bullet points. Including widening Irick Road improvement, two way left turn. All those bullet points have been proposed to the county.

Mr. Desario states – Yes. The county has a traffic study, the one that I referenced, that's part of your site plan application the County has in their possession of as well.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Scott Daniel (Mr. Daniel) the architect on record for this project.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Daniel to state his education, credentials, and your experience as an architect.

Mr. Daniel states - I am the director of architecture for Ware Malcomb for the Northeast region. I have a Bachelor of Architecture from New Jersey's Institute of Technology. I am a licensed architect in New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland and have been so for 30 years and I've been practicing architecture for over 30 years or so. I've testified before the board previously and many within the state of New Jersey.

Mr. Borger states that the Board will recognize Mr. Daniel as an expert in Architecture based upon his educational background experience and licensure, such that he'll be able to render opinions in that field before this Board.

Mr. Floyd states - Scott will be referencing several exhibits this evening all of which were prepared by his office. We'll be starting with exhibit A3 which is the floor plans and the elevations for building number one. I think it's important to show the Floor Plan and the elevations for both buildings.

Mr. Daniel states - What you see before you is exhibit A3, this is one of two buildings that are proposed on site. This is building one which is 307,520 square feet of warehouse space. It contains 53 truck docks and is roughly 992 feet long and 310 feet in width. The height clearance height is 36 feet. The exterior envelope will be constructed of precast concrete panels. It'll sit on a concrete foundation typical of footings on grade slab and the interior structure will be a steel structure of columns, girders, web joists, the roof will be constructed of a metal deck extruded insulation and a single ply roof. The elevations depict the top elevation showing the East elevation of the building, which is pictured on the truck, dock side as you can see, the length of the elevation has been broken up by use of color schemes, vertical placements and to enhance the texture of the building to break up the monolithic structure overall structure of the building. I'll move now to elevations on the south side of the building, which is what faces the Turnpike and Irick Road.

As you can see, it's even further broken into individual buildings if you will it's more of a Business Park as opposed to an industrial type of building again with the use of different color schemes and enhance color to even further break up the elevation. Lastly, for this these are the short elevations that show even more of how the building will be broken up and constructed. What I'm showing here in a little more detail is the use of window space. If I go back to the first drawing from earlier this can be broken up into several tenants. What we're showing here is proposing that it could be broken up as much as four tenants but typically, there'll be an office space on each of the corners and that's where we will utilize windows and glazing to make it appear to be more of a business building than an industrial building.

Mr. Floyds asks to share to exhibit A4 the conceptual floor plans and elevations for building two which contains three slides.

Mr. Daniel states - The only difference really with this building is the actual size of the building. This building is 205,140 square feet. It's got three proposed truck docks. It'll also be 36 feet clear as a minimum, same type of envelope construction and same type of interior section utilizing steel. The elevations are primarily the same. This is more of an office park type of atmosphere or feeling and keeps the consistency of the actual buildings within the built environment. I'd like to move on to one of the renderings which is exhibit A5. What we're showing here is how we are going to delineate the architecture of the entry feature. This clearly marks the entrance for the employee gives it more of a grand entrance. The use of an accent color brings your eye towards that color. Can we move on to exhibit A6 a building perspective from an aerial view. This shows you Irick Road and the New Jersey Turnpike. This is Irick Road, and this is the main entrance where the employees would enter. This shows you let's call it the front of the building one, the front of building two. As we move down Irick Road onto Woodlane Road is right where my cursor is this right here is the main entrance for the trucks as they come along on the side of the building. We are going to exhibit A7 which is an aerial view looking towards the truck dock area. There is a retaining wall which backs up to this property line here and pretty much shows you that all the truck traffic will be towards the rear of the building.

Mr. Floyd states - The applicant has constructed another building in the township at 100 Western Drive. There's always questions by board members in any jurisdiction about what's being proposed, but it might be like the one that has already been constructed so Exhibit A8 is a photograph of the existing building at 100 Western drive the loading dock area.

Mr. Daniel states - That is correct. So, what we're looking at here is how they look in its built form. Your different coloration, your shadow lines from your reveals and broken up to as far as the top goes. We can change to exhibit A9 which is the photographic accented corner of the building. This shows the actual built environment of a corner entry. As you can see, as I discussed earlier that you have the accent bands in the front, you have your glazing, and you also have your change in elevation. But you also have your color change to enhance the feature.

Mr. Borger asks if the Board has any questions for Mr. Daniel.

Mr. Thorpe states – Can you go back to exhibit A8? This is a photograph of an existing building and you said this is how it will look. I just want to get this clarified and on the record that this doesn't look at like your plans from the truck perspective this is a big flat white building with no delineation. So, I want to know when you said this is how it will look what we really mean by that.

Mr. Daniel states - I misspoke and I didn't use the correct words or verbiage in this. This is how it will appear as far as the precast concrete panels and the color. This does not represent the elevations 100% but similarly so I apologize for misspeaking about that.

Mr. Thorpe states – Can you bring up A7? Regarding the retaining wall, how long is that the foliage and the buffer?

Mr. Rochce states – With the buffer in total it is 25 feet. Right now, we have it from the property line to the retaining wall, approximately 10 feet. The intention is to place plantings on the high side of the wall, which will be with the



Burlington County facilities say and they will also have planted a little side of the wall within our bioretention basins. On site. There was a comment although from the landscape professionals with CMA about potentially adding tree species selection in this area. We have that 10-foot width maybe we'll plant more evergreens, not only for year round screening, we're already proposing a lot of evergreens but for the area, it's just less of a risk of roots, again, was that retaining wall?

Mr. Borger states - I have a follow up question to Mr. Daniel. If you go back to A8 the building is mostly white in the upper portion with maybe the 25% painted gray. Is that what we can anticipate as opposed to the photograph that was shown to us with the red color?

Mr. Daniel states – On the rear of the building will be more changing color in the facade on the truck dockside in these elevations and there are in what you're seeing in the other is you're seeing white throughout from the top of the truck dock and up really are breaking out more using two different color schemes on that one. So, it'll be even more broken, broken up as far as the monolithic look of that.

Mr. Borger asks if anyone has any more questions.

Mr. Thorpe states – Can you bring exhibit A7 up again. Can I get a clarification and I want to address this to our planner this and on your report. You talk about this and talk about a 50-foot-wide buffer screen shall be provided for all nonresidential properties and abutting residential zones. The BCIT campus is technically a residential use located within a residential zone. How does this all work together?

Mr. Dochney states - To clarify here and I don't recall off the top of my head the list of variances and waivers there is a little bit of an inconsistencies between the different sections of the township code zoning section within the industrial district sites the different district I forget which one it is off the top of my head in terms of the buffering requirements and within that section of the code a nonresidential use to a nonresidential use does not technically require an actual landscape buffer. The design standards section of your code it does require that for a nonresidential use which abuts a residential zone, it doesn't specify use residential zone which is the R5 zone which I believe a 50 foot buffer is required. For the zoning standards no buffers required at the site plan standards a 50-foot buffer is required and they do not have a 50-foot buffer on their Eastern property line so that they would require a design waiver for that. And I do have concerns over the adequacy of the buffer they're proposing since it is a school immediately there and they have I mean, as you can see the drawing that's on the screen, essentially. I think it's a staggered row of evergreens but not what would be required if a 50-foot buffer for residential use was there. So, it doesn't quite meet the requirements of the 50 foot buffer to a residential zone even though it's not a residential use. It is a residential zone and to some extent, although school people don't live there or sleep there it is a place of education for a large portion of the community. The students and teachers are there, you know, 8 to 10 hours a day Monday through Friday. So, I think it is appropriate to treat it as in some respects for a land use perspective, a little bit similar to a residence. I want to clarify that there is no variance required but a design waiver is required for the lack of buffering that is proposed at this time.

Mr. Borger asks if the Board or Professionals have anymore questions. There were none.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Greg Woodruff (Mr. Woodruff).

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Woodruff - Would you please state your education, employment credentials and experience for the record?

Mr. Woodruff states - I'm an associate principal with Langan engineering, environmental services. I am a licensed planner, as the other professionals have referenced my license is current, I'm a licensed in the state of New Jersey as well as nationally with the American Institute of Certified planners. I have been licensed in practicing as a planner since 2008. I have appeared before many boards and accepted as an expert in planning throughout the state of New Jersey.

Mr. Borger states - Based on this educational background, licensure and is experienced by license planner. He is recognized by board as an expert in that field and can render expert opinions in the field of public planning.

Mr. Floyd states – Mr. Woodruff will be doing two exhibits prepared by him in his office Exhibit A 10 is a site aerial of 710 Rancocas Road and exhibit A11 is a site aerial of 45 East Park Drive. Can you run through the existing conditions and the proposed improvements. But he just went through them briefly to show your familiarity with the site and then talk about the background planning documents that you reviewed.

Mr. Woodruff states - From a planning perspective I'm going to restate some of the description that you heard Mr. Roche go through and some of the description in Mr. Floyd's introduction. The site is identified as block 804 lot 12. It's plus or minus a 43-acre site. It's located in the industrial zone, as has been discussed. Its current use is agricultural. There is the existing cell tower, identified and discussed on the roughly 900 square foot portion of the site. You can see on the rendered site plan here my cursor is hovering over it. It's at the edge of the property along the Turnpike, at the corner, roughly of the Turnpike, and Irick Road. The surrounding development you can see here on the aerial, to the project's West is agricultural lands further in the distance to the north is open space to the east as has been discussed and described is the BCIT campus and to the south is low density residential development along and to the south of Woodlane Road. So relatively, the background planning documents that I reviewed as part of preparing for the application started, of course with the 1997 Master Plan. In that document, just one section that I want to reference and again, I don't want to go into detail for that specific report. But one thing to highlight was on page 19 there is reference in the section that discusses plans of contiguous municipalities. There is discussion of the area along Mill Creek and Irick Road being designated as industrial district and commercial district on Irick Road that date all the way back to 1997. There are discussions that's when the area is designated as an industrial zone working our way through the presenting reports that have happened since then, in 2000, there was a reexamination report that the township went through. The only thing I noted in that report from a planning perspective, interestingly, it was reference to potentially expanding cell phone tower uses in the industrial zone. I'm not quite certain in the history of the township I wasn't acted upon, but I did note that was referenced. In the 2003 reexamination it did not note any significant things that were proposed to the industrial zone. In the 2015 reexamination report, there was no reference modifications to the industrial zone. There was a reference to farmland and some along the 541 corridor being an interim use and not necessarily being on the priority preservation acquisition list. But no reference to proposed changes to the industrial zone. And then most recently for the 2020 reexamination report, there were no proposed changes to the industrial zone that that I noted in that report that were referenced.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Woodruff - Just for the sake of clarity reviewed the 1990 master plan reexamination, the 2000 reexamination report, the 2006 reexamination report, the 2015 reexamination report and the 2020 reexamination report, and there were no recommendations related to this property in changing the current industrial zone designation Correct.

Mr. Woodruff states - No, not that I have noticed.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Woodruff - Can you provide a summary of the relief that's being requested?

Mr. Woodruff states - I'll start with the first piece of relief that's been requested to use variance for the existing cell tower. The cell tower, as has been noted, the cell phone on the property and was approved via a use variance in 1997. It was constructed shortly after the approval and has existed on the property since that time. So, from a planning perspective, I think that's the most important thing to know is that the cell tower was previously approved by the town via use variance and has existed and operated on the property essentially since and really speaks to the credibility of the cell tower because it exists there currently. The cell tower exists on the property and was licensed at the time to provide coverage for the network in the area. So, it is contributing to the general welfare of providing a cell network in this area, seem to at the time of its original approval, listed there since and continues to satisfy that requirement. Some other

issues to know relative to the cell towers existence and what is proposed here is important to the size of the cell tower area and the fact that there are no improvements being proposed, as was noted the cell tower, and encompasses about 900 square feet of the site, which was noted, equates to less than 1/10 of 1% of the site. Mr. Pew referenced at the time that the cell tower was planned it was done with great care taken to locating it at the edge of the site along the Turnpike, so that it didn't hinder the use of rest of the site at the time with the agricultural use. Similarly, it will not as part of that has been taken in the proposed layout for the proposed permitted warehouse use. As it has been noted that agricultural use is proposed to be replaced with the warehouses which is a permitted use. You heard Mr. Roche testified that the site layout where the cell tower is now that no improvements are proposed to that area and how the access drive is conveniently located in proximity to where that cell tower is located for continued maintenance and other activities that may need to take place irregularly as this cell tower. Both in the opinion of the cell tower user and the applicant, the applicant continued the operation of a cell tower on the property with the warehouse buildings in place does not pose an issue for the applicant. And similarly, the warehouses being on the property with the cell tower do not pose an issue for the cell tower operator. So again, I think that speaks to how the layout has been developed and coordinated. Overall, to make sure that it fits within both user's needs. I'd like to talk a little bit about some of the purposes of the build that I think are advanced here. This is to encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate user development in the state in a manner which will promote the public health safety, morals, and welfare. As I noted, at the time of its original approval the cell tower was deemed to support the general welfare. It was a licensed cell tower that was part of the coverage network. It was constructed it has operated on the site since that time and continues to support that General Welfare. I think it's also important on this point to point out from a planning perspective, if the cell tower were to be located somewhere else, the minimum size lot size in this zone is a five-acre parcel so to play out a little bit of an alternate planning scenario of cell tower existing on another site. There would need to be another five-acre parcel that would be dedicated for a cell tower from a planning perspective. That just to meet seemed like an efficient use of land and would not be in the best interest of good planning. I would note to some of my observations, both around the state as well as sites that we've noted through some aerial and other reconnaissance around the town. It does appear that having cell towers on parcels that have other uses, is common. It's certainly common around the state and I think they're even examples of it that will reference within the township that clearly show that it's a common practice for that to happen. Relative to purpose G, to provide sufficient space in a location for a variety of agricultural, residential, recreational, and industrial uses and open space, both public and private according to their environmental requirements to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens. Clearly, the application is for a use variance for an existing cell tower. It's an appropriate use for that cell tower as it exists there today, and it provides utility for that coverage network for the existing cellular network now and will continue to do so in the future. Relative to the evaluation of the negative criteria, in my opinion, there's no substantial detriment to the public good. Again, this cell towers existed on the site for over 20 years. The way it was previously, obviously approved by the township and met all those requirements at the time has operated and existed on the property since 1997. In the other exhibits that Mr. Floyd referenced, I'd like to pull up now that we prepared as we were trying to research some of the other similar situations that may have taken place in the area to try to understand from a planning perspective, the threshold that the Board may have utilized in the past to evaluate locations like this, other than of course, this site in and of itself was approved by the Board previously. So, I'm going to pull up exhibit A10 here, which the exhibit is labeled aerial and the address listed here is 710 Rancocas Road. It is an aerial photo identifying the site as well as a cell tower on the site. For those who don't recognize that address the 710 Rancocas Road addresses is the Township building. I'm, if I'm going to zoom in a little bit to the site location inset in the upper right-hand corner of the plan, just to give some general reference to where that site is relative to the subject of the application. So, you can see the subject of the application outlined in a dashed line here in the upper right, inset and the site that is on this aerial is more for lower left of that inset. There is an arrow, zoom back out here. I apologize if that's causing any issues, but the cell tower on that site is called out with this arrow here. The reason that we referenced this or the reason that I looked into this site was really just, again, in trying to understand how the Board may have looked at this, we're trying to understand the cell towers in the township. This was

a site where there is a cell tower located on the property per our review. It appears that the cell tower is on the same tax lot as the township building. It incorporates or it encompasses a small footprint area is nearby and adjacent to a parking area again this has similarities to the way the cell tower has been incorporated into the design for the project section that's before the board. The other example that I wanted to reference, and this is A11 labeled aerial view of 45 East Park Drive. This is a site location inset at the upper right-hand corner. Again, the property that is the subject of the application is outlined in a yellow dashed line and the generally the upper right of that inset and the site is highlighted in in roughly the lower left of that inset. This site is also in the industrial zone, and I should note that the site that we looked at previously is actually immediately adjacent to the industrial zone but it's in a residential zone. The township building is in a residential but is immediately adjacent to the industrial zone. This property is in the industrial zone as well. This example is not a cell tower, they are billboards, but billboards and cell towers are somewhat similar in terms of being another use on one property. It appears that the billboards in this case are probably slightly less incorporated into the overall site design they appear to essentially be constructed in the parking field with some barriers around them to keep vehicles or trailers away from them, but similar in terms of how they might operate relative to or like a cell tower. So, this research was really just trying to understand the board's threshold for how these layouts have occurred on objects with either cell towers or a billboard, which is similar, not necessarily, in my opinion from a planning perspective, as beneficial as a cell tower but again, a similar structure to a certain extent, in the evaluation of this from a planning perspective. The board certainly made a good decision, as Mr. Pew discussed the layout of where this cell tower located was very forward thinking in terms of being able to utilize the rest of the property for other uses. In this case, what is before the board is a is a permitted use, there will be access there will continue to be access easements and other agreements to allow that cell tower to exist and operate effectively and efficiently without having to over utilize a larger area of land only for it. I would like to move into the bulk issues that are being requested. The first that I'd like to address is the accessory structure in the front yard that was noted in Mr. Dochney's letter. So, this one relates to the fire pump station and the waiver of variance is requested ordinance section 250-22a(1) where accessory structures are not permitted in the front yard. We are proposing a fire pump station within the front yard. The site is unique because it has multiple front yards that was noted before. Clearly you have Woodlane, Irick which have full form front yards. So that was a bit of a unique sight here that it does have two front yards. The fire pump station was placed on the outside of the yard setback distance. As you can see there is a good amount of screening that's been proposed. And I think it's important to note from a planning perspective that the project team and the applicant coordinated with the water provider and the location of the fire pump station was recommended by them as where they would prefer it to be because of its location closer to the access point. From a planning perspective, there's an aspect of the unique in that it has the two front yards but I also think the benefit of this being where the water provider prefers it outweighs the limited detriment of it being in the front yard, especially when coupled with the fact that there is screening that's proposed and the distance between where it is and the actual property line is actually outside of that front yard setback. It just happens to be in the front yard. New Jersey American Water wanted it there for reasons of public health, welfare, and safety if there was an emergency or a fire. The next issue that I address, provided Mr. Dochney's letter was regarding the lighting. There's a waiver variance requested from Ordinance Section 250-22g, which requires the maximum average light level of 0.5-foot candles. The proposed lighting design has average levels between two and three and a half for some paved areas and 0.8 for some sidewalk areas. The proposed lighting generally matches industry standards and is needed in specific instances to properly light certain areas. In my opinion from a planning perspective, there are benefits clearly to having some of these take place and I think Mr. Dochney's letter even references his agreement with that opinion, and he did not see a major issue with them. In my opinion, the exceedances do provide benefit relative to creating a better lit and safer condition in the instances where there are the limited exceedances that were noted. The next issue I would like to discuss is the comment relative to structures in the buffer. The applicant is seeking a waiver variance and is requesting a monument sign, directional signage, the access driveways, the guardrails, and the retaining wall all which are within buffer strip areas around the site. From a planning perspective, I think its difficult to provide access drives with a structure that has two frontages. I would put these requests in the

category of the benefits of these outweighing limited or perceived minimal detriments. You know things like human signs, directional signage, the access driveways, and guardrails, we heard discussion of the retaining wall. All these things provide benefits to the overall site layout, effective and efficient access and notification of the property. In my opinion, those justifications provide benefits outweigh the limited detriment of some of those being in those buffer strip areas and they do not appear to be excessive. As Mr. Roache testified, in the case of the retaining wall, the vast majority of that retaining wall won't actually even be visible to the property owner will be mostly visible from the subject property and similarly, guardrails, directional signs are all necessary for the site to function.

Mr. Floyd asks Mr. Woodruff – Can you now address the waiver for front yard parking?

Mr. Woodruff states - From section 196-8b(4) we're requesting waiver for parking in the front yard and the fact that there may be a landscape berm required. There are some berms that that have been incorporated to the extent that they can be, and I think that in some cases, there are some topographic challenges that don't necessarily allow it to be consumed. But from a planning perspective, I would argue a couple things. First, this is unique because it has two front yards which creates additional area that this must be complied with. There are clear benefits that are being proposed that there are berms and buffering will be augmented with plantings as well as some of those typographical changes. So, from a planning perspective, the intent of this requirement has been met, if not fully in all places. But again, those places are driven by practical issues of topographic challenges and things like that. So, in my opinion, there are clearly benefits here that weigh the detriments and there are clearly some unique characteristics that make compliance difficult. Relative to the purposes of the MLUL that I think are advanced, specifically relating to the variance and waiver requests, I would say purpose A in my opinion the project including the minor waiver and variances that have been requested, facilitate the development of a permitted modern warehouse use and as a result, they aren't necessary to further public health and general welfare. I referred to a number of the requirements whether they be retaining walls, signage, things like that are just part of the overall efficient use of the site and I think the vast majority of those fall into the category of supporting that. So, in conclusion, the use variance encompasses a reapproval of an existing cell tower that was previously given a use variance on this site. The cell tower has existed and operated as a licensed facility on the site since it was approved in 1997 and it continues to be an integral part of the phone coverage network for the area. I think for all those reasons, you know, the relevant proof standards and case law have been met for the board to grant that variance. There are a couple goals from the townships master plan and reexamination reports that I think are worth noting. In the goals section for nonresidential districts is to attract appropriate high profile uses that will provide economic development opportunities to residents. The 1997 plan notes that the changes for both 295 and the New Jersey Turnpike, provide transportation geography that present traffic challenges while presenting opportunities for beneficial development. I think it's also worth noting that the 2000 reexamination report recommended that the township is permitting wireless cell towers as conditional use. Through all the reexamination reports, there has not been a recommendation to change permitted uses in the industrial zone.

Mr. Borger asks if anyone had any more questions or comments.

Mr. Dochney asks - I think what needs to be addressed a little further the D1 use variance testimony, which I think was comprehensive and back to addressing the cellphone, or I think there's a little more that needs to be addressed. The D variance here are a little more nuanced than it is. If the application were to be denied, the cellphone tower can remain it's already been permitted by a Use variance back in 1997. So, the reason for the use variance now is looking at it as a matter of two uses on one property. Now it's a cell phone tower and the two warehouse seems like it's also that your ordinance does not permit it unless it is essentially a shopping center or an industrial park. Multiple uses on the same site that are completely independent of one another. So that's one aspect of the use variance. It's not just the cell tower being an unpermitted use, use variance to allow the cellphone tower to remain it is a to use to get the warehouses and distribution centers are permitted uses in the district, just a combination of the two uses and the ability of the site to accommodate both uses together. In terms of the lighting in this review letter reasonably point out that the variance is

required for exceeding the maximum average foot candles over the site. I don't think there's anywhere in this review letter between my comments or Mr. Roberts comments that said one way or another that we thought this was not a big deal or no issues. I will say that a maximum average foot candle is 0.5 Foot Candles is a strict standard and can be difficult to meet.

Mr. Borger states – We've seen this over and over that applicants come in and are unable to propose safe lighting with a 0.5 footcandle usage and still have safety and security covered. This has come up several time and it's something that will have to be addressed by the township committee in the next review because it's a frequent issue. Nobody seems to be able to function with the industrial standards being much higher, than a point five average foot candle lighting throughout the property.

Mr. Dochney states - There is a discrepancy in the two ordinances the to two sections are your zoning and your design standards. I wouldn't say they disagree with one another they use different terminology when requires a 25-foot buffer to non-residential-to-non-residential use. The other bases it on the zoning classification rather than the actual land use. Typically, what I've seen, and I think your code probably have this as a statement in there somewhere that where there's a conflict in the ordinance the stricter provision is usually supposed to govern that usually would apply or those situations usually come up when they're within the same section of the ordinance as in both in the zoning section. But different sections of zoning and certainly wants to design standard ones a zoning standard. I might think that the stricter standard here 50 feet would still apply but I just note that it is design standard and not a zoning standard and therefore the actual burden of proof for the applicant is a little less for a design standard than it is for a zoning standard. It does require a going through and positive and negative in terms of no substantial detriment and showing that there are special reasons or a that there's some sort of harm, but they do have to show that these conditions are reasonable and not substantially altering or substantially impairing the intent of the site design here in terms of which does call for a 50-foot buffer. I think that a 50-foot buffer would be more appropriate here than 25 foot even though the zoning code does permit 25 foot in non-residential.

Mr. Borger asks if anyone had any more questions.

Mr. Guerrero states- Looking at the site plan I do see some berming there along Woodlane Road, but I don't see any along Irick and I think that's probably one of the more important sides of the building, especially since you will be able to see it from Irick Road. I think berming in with the landscaping is an important feature for that side of the property.

Mr. Dochney states – For Industrial uses the ordinance does not require berms, but it says the Board may require berms at your discretion. If the Board it is appropriate and would negate the negative impacts, you can require a berm of up to five feet. I don't know whether there's enough room in that area to accommodate that slope with the plantings.

Mr. Woodruff states - There are some grading issues in that area. So, you know, I don't know if we want to get into a more detailed discussion of that or have it be something that would potentially get worked out among professionals.

Mr. Hudson states - There are some grading constraints in that area. I will note that it's in the ordinance that allows for a two to one slope as slope and if we're able to use that criteria we can certainly add berms across the frontage on Irick. They may not get the five feet, but I would like to be able to work with township planner and landscaper to come up with a solution. Maybe we can plant three-foot plantings on top of the berm.

Mr. Thorpe states – Berms are one of the most important features and I would actually be saying that I would like to see five-foot berms on both sides, along Irick Road and Woodlane Road.

Mr. Guerrero states - You also have area between your entrance there on the curve and the bridge along Irick and you should be able to maintain that five foot there as well.

Mr. Hudson states - At this point in time, I don't think I have any issues on Irick and Woodlane adding a berm and I will take a closer look at direct understanding that the board has a strong desire to carry that berm all the way through.

Mr. Borger asks – If anyone else has any questions of the applicant's planner?

Mr. Thorpe states – Regarding Mr. Dochney's memo and his response to the lighting, and specifically revise the plans to indicate pose timers and hours of operation. We recommend light levels be dim during nonoperational hours. So obviously, tenants and stuff but the lighting on the south side of the parking lot and the south side of building which faces Woodland Road should all be dimmable equipment.

Mr. Hudson states – When the designing was been done, it was our intention of having no spillage to adjacent properties, and it doesn't take back anything that we've discussed in the last two minutes here. It'll make those fixtures dimmable or restrict them.

Mr. Borger asks if anyone had any more questions.

Mr. Guerrero states – I have a question about the traffic flow. I'm trying to get a better understanding of how the traffic would get to the site. Meaning is the Jersey Turnpike the primary source of your traffic or is there some other ways are the main axis. If so from those roadways on which way, are you planning for them to get into the site, whether it's Woodlane or Irick?

Mr. Desario states - We would anticipate the majority would be accommodated by the Turnpike. As for cars, you would anticipate that the traffic is distributed amongst different routes that surround the site. Some would come from the Turnpike; some would come from 295 some would come from more of the local roads along the 541 corridor as an example. There's a detailed table in our traffic study that assigns specific percentages to specific routes.

Mr. Guerrero states – I've seen those numbers. That's why I just asked to make sure this made sense. I'm just going right back to the truck traffic specifically if you're talking about New Jersey Turnpike, we have Exit 5 as our interchange within the township. Would you anticipate your traffic coming down Irick or splitting that on Woodlane or are you anticipating the majority coming down the main road?

Mr. Desario states – The majority would come down with Woodlane but some of it would come down Irick as well.

Mr. Guerrero states – Can you tell us again what percentage of the truck traffic that you said would be generated Woodlane and Irick?

Mr. Desario states - Between 541 and the site, approximately 50% would use Irick Road to and from the north. On the west side of the Turnpike to and from the north 25%. Then Woodlane Road on the west side of the Turnpike to and from the south 25%. That 25% to and from the south along Woodlane Road would be oriented to the 295 Corridor, but it would be trucks that would be oriented to the south on 295. We anticipate 25% of our trucks would be coming to and from the south alone to 295. As the board is aware as the public, there's a weight restriction on Irick Road between Rancocas and Woodlane. So that would require trucks to use Springside Road and Woodlane Road to get to and from the site.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Jeffrey Barron (Mr. Barron) – Attorney for Kristina Goetz and he has testimony but doesn't feel that he can get it all done before the 10:30pm stop time. Board decides to continue with another special meeting on November 7<sup>th</sup> at 6:15pm.

**OPEN MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Mr. Sullivan swears in - Deborah Kwartin – Browns Mills NJ. I've been employed at BCIT for 26 years. I'm greatly concerned with a couple things. One being the driveway, I'm coming out and making a left at lunchtime I do periodically make a right there is constantly back up sometimes beyond the school. We have buses in and out of there which use Irick Road, Springside Road and Woodlane Road. We don't have our own transportation, so we rely on the sending districts to bring students to our school. We are a school that starts later in the morning, so our buses typically start arriving any time by 7:30 to 7:45 and then they leave 2:46 In the afternoon. We also have student drivers and right now there are 90 of them that drive in and out of school. It is very hectic in the morning and afternoon, and I happen to look at the diagram and saw there the driveway is coming out and I don't know how that is going to happen. I don't think it's a great location.

Mr. Sullivan swears in John Arsenault – 19 Orchard Lane, Westampton NJ. The testimony that was given by Mr. Roache talked about the lighting and the requirement being .5-foot candles. Mr. Roache stated it was going to be 1.7-foot candles. Which obviously, quite a lot larger than what the requirement is when Mr. Woodruff came up, he said it was going to be 2-3. So, there's a discrepancy there that needs to be looked at. I've lived here for over 30 years I used to take my kids to that field to look through our telescope at night to see the stars and that's going to now be impossible with that lighting. Mr. Desario was talking about the traffic report, and he was talking about doing traffic studies at the western side of Irick and Woodlane and I didn't hear anything regarding studies at 541 and Woodlane, which is where all their tractor and trailer will be coming in if I have my notes correct. So, 100% of the tractor trailers coming in, and 50% coming out if I remember correctly. I'm not a traffic expert, but I am an expert in the traffic that is here and trying to make a left out of Orchard is impossible today to the point where we must go through the development to go up to a traffic light or go all the way-out bypass. Adding even one tractor trailer is going to prohibit traffic from being able to get from point A to point B and I'm not necessarily concerned about myself because I'm retired, and I can adjust when I go do things. What I'm worried about is the fire department, the EMS, and the schools and in some respects, you know the library there's a lot of traffic that goes in and out of the library. My biggest concern really is wrapped around the traffic with regard to the emergency services being able to get through as I had stated, in addition to that we're talking about noise pollution, we're talking about air pollution. It boggles my mind that this company wants to try to squeeze in two warehouses into what is considered residential neighborhood as far as I'm concerned. I moved here to get to a nice residential place to live for the rest of my life and right now we are absolutely surrounded by warehouses. We're not against warehouses, we're not against truckers, we're not against employment opportunities. But what I think we're against is having a warehouse near a residential district or area.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Larry Harris – 2 Forest View Drive, Westampton NJ. I've lived here 26 and I agree with Mr. Arsenault that the traffic is going to be a problem. I've sat here since about 7:30 and the traffic coming down from Rancocas heading towards Woodlane has been at least 6-7 cars per minute. I do have some concerns about the trucks coming off the 295. You stated that the traffic coming from 295 will be about 25%, historically trucks have come down Irick Road heading toward Woodlane Road and disregard the five-ton limit. It is my belief that if you were to put this warehouse in place that the traffic would continue to come down Irick Road off at 295 because of the easy access and I think it will be almost impossible to stop it. My other concern is the height of the warehouse, from what I understand the warehouse going to be more than 40 feet which is four stories. Are you putting a four-story warehouse, brightly lit according to the lighting in a residential area, which is a contradiction to the area, and it really is going to infringe on the on the area itself and especially the residents that live on Woodlane Road.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Amber Pingitore - 71 Sherwood Lane in Westampton, NJ. I am going to echo the traffic which is a huge concern. In the previous application I made the same comments on September 1, 2021. So, it was more than a year ago that I've made this comment and this comment was recorded and in public record minutes brought to the board and to the applicant. They had ample time to rectify this, and they have chosen not to, in fact they spoke to it today as if it was valid. Mr. Roache referenced the letter from Fish and Wildlife. The Board Member Mr. Grace even asked about it and Mr. Roache was very confident that this letter was valid and it's not. I can read to you the letter dated January 18, 2021. The bottom paragraph of the first page says, the enclosed list may change as new information about listed species



becomes available as per federal regulation at 50 CFR 402 list is only valid for 90 days. This list was expired as of April 18, 2021, and yet it is spoken about in tonight's presentation as if it is valid. It is not, this fish and wildlife information is grossly outdated the applicant decided to do nothing about it, even though I raised it more than a year ago. That makes me question the validity of a lot of other statements that they've made and the effort that they have made in this application on getting the facts and making sure that things are accurate and that the public is being shared with accurate information and that the board members are being told accurate information. I do not trust them, and they can't get simple facts correct on paper, even when they have been given a heads up more than a year ago. I would expect you would question this and how they've chosen to disregard these facts and federal regulations. Obviously, I have all the other same concerns about neighborhood quality, character, height, the light everything the traffic, of course, but just how sloppy this applicant has been, how haphazardly it's been put together and complete disregard for the community stakeholders every step along the way. Thank you.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Ronald Kuriskin – 4 Oak Tree Court, Westampton NJ. Since the warehouse has no tenants the worst-case design factors should be addressed and presented to the Westampton and the County to the evaluate. Specifically using a high-volume performance center or a partial hub not a general warehouse numbers such as using the 150 criteria that was mentioned in the traffic studies. The traffic management plan is going to be after the fact meaning warehouses would already be built. They are only promises not concrete facts and we cannot assume that they will be fulfilled. The county has not approved anything. The applicant should specify to the county the exact traffic improvements with specific design details to be made so the county can review the designs first before anything is built. The applicant has noted in the traffic impact study that they are using the Highway Capacity Manual sixth edition. This is out of date and now invalid. The latest version is the seventh edition. Consequently, this invalidates the data presented. The turning radius for typical WB-62 tractor trailer combination is about 70-80 feet in total length it's about 45 feet for the cabs leading outer edge to the bumper. It appears that the trailer cab would impinge on oncoming traffic lane opposite it when turning in addition to the rear inner tire radius that could also run off onto the roadway edge causing crumbling and deterioration over time. As the applicant checked and verified that against the NJDOT design manuals or other tractor trailer turning radius manuals and diagrams readily available. It sounds as if they know this will already be a problem. This would also pose a hazard to pedestrian and bicycles at the corners, especially as the bridge approaches over the turnpike overpass bridge as well as the current traffic light T of Irick and Woodlane corner. Is the applicant improving or installing pedestrian sidewalks, bicycle lanes, curbing or handicap curb access along their property lines? There seems to be no reference made addressing those design requirements in their submitted application documents. I'm also concerned that there'll be increased traffic from local streets to avoid said traffic and backups at the three lights along Woodlane Road, potentially effecting pedestrians and children in the local neighborhoods. This already can be seen with cars taking a shortcut and Irick and Parkview Drive to avoid the backup at the corner traffic signal on Rancocas and Irick Road as well as cars taking a shortcut on Irick and Maple Avenue to avoid the backup at the corner traffic signal light on Irick. Consequently, I urge the Board to reject the application because detrimental increased traffic and traffic patterns, as well as other objections raised by the public and to be raised is not in the best interest of the residents of Westampton nor in the public good.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Jessica Bongiovanni – 23 Devonshire Court, Westampton, NJ. I've lived here about 5 years with my husband and I'm from Mercer County. We have a young family and when I heard about this growing up I was devastated. I just have a few points that I want to make. Truck drivers are like everyone else and make mistakes. I can tell you that I've seen trucks going down Irick Road that has the weight limit on it. I have the same concern about the traffic coming off 541 onto Woodlane. You can never make a left turn out of Orchard it's almost impossible and adding a bunch of trucks is going to make it worse. There is a special services school on the other side of where it's being proposed. I'm worried for children, you know, thinking about children potentially running and playing with all these trucks on the road. It's just doesn't mix. There's also a long walkway there that goes right to the library, and I keep thinking about all these trucks that are going to be on our residential road. It's just something that I don't think belongs there or is it going to be safe. I'm also concerned about the light pollution, and it doesn't seem like a solid number on how much light is going to be there. I know there was a proposal about dimming however, if it's a warehouse I doubt

this is going to be an office where it's like a nine to five and they do it at night. People will probably be there at night. That's when truck drivers drive and that's when they deliver things at night, so I'm thinking that's going to be lit all night.

Mr. Sullivan swears in Brian Morgan- 3 Maple Tree Drive, Westampton, NJ. This warehouse is going to be a monstrosity and it doesn't matter how much paint is put on it it's going to be an eyesore. I think that the applicants have acknowledged that this place has no business being a warehouse area because they're attempting to make it look like a commercial building rather than an industrial building. I think they even acknowledge that it doesn't fit. The negative impact on property value is a big unknown and certainly not going to be impacted positively. Everybody that lives in this area is going to see their property values drop. There's no guarantee that there's not going to be hazardous materials stored in this building. We've talked about a school being there and a daycare center being there. Every truck coming in is a hazardous material transporter because it has diesel fuel in it. How is that going to be contained? How are those spills going to be stopped from getting into the wetlands where the turtles live and the kids that live next door or are going to school next door. I'm sure that Mr. Pew who testified earlier that he's going to get much more for this land than \$4,500 that was paid for it in 1999 according to tax records. I'm curious as to whether if he was living next door to this building, would he still be on board with this? While the board has the right to grant waivers, the board has no obligation to do that and the fact that so many waivers are needed for this project is just as another example that is doesn't belong in this area. If you really look at the traffic study some of the things that were in those tables, not stated in the testimony tonight. It talks about a typical weekday being 308 trucks per day. Somebody testified earlier that this is not going to be a 24/7 operation. Let's assume it's 12 to 18 hours a day that's 19-30 trucks per hour going down these roads. In addition to that they said 584 cars per weekday, that's almost 900 vehicles per weekday coming in and out of that building. They talked about during the peak pm hour there'll be 78 cars leaving the facility during that hour. It's not going to be 78 cars leaving during that hour, it's going to be 78 leaving in the same 10 minutes because everybody punches out so where are the 78 going? They're going to get mixed in during rush hour traffic we already have if they change their hours to leave before rush hour, they're going to get mixed in with the school traffic. It was insisted upon by the traffic expert, that trucks could make a turn on the west side of the Turnpike between Irick and Woodlane. Now tonight, we hear those trucks can't make that turn, we must put a light up. So, if that testimony has changed so drastically the streets didn't change and if they have changed their position on that what else have they not yet changed the position on but it's not really being represented accurately. A few things need to be reentered into testimony is there's no shoulder on Woodlane to allow for emergency vehicles to get by. I was a fire engine driver for 10 years up in Mercer County and I know what he's like trying to get a fire apparatus around tractor trailers that are on road that they don't belong on. In the Spring one of the board members asked the applicant to sit down with the Chief of Fire and Police and talk about any concerns they had, and I don't recall any of that submitted here as testimony. I'm still interested in hearing what their thoughts are regarding this entire process. There's no reasonable expectation that anyone on in this application can guarantee or even reasonably predicted there will not be truck traffic on Irick Road in the no truck zone it happens now and it's going to increase. Maple Tree Drive is already a bypass for people doing 55 mph when it's 25-mph trying to beat the light and this is only going to get worse only half of our street has sidewalks and there are a whole bunch of new families that have just moved in on this road that have kids waiting for busses. We have people going up the street at 45-55 m.p.h. trying to beat the light. Where are trucks going to go when they come down from the Turnpike or 295 and make that horrible left onto the bridge come down realized that they needed to make a left onto Woodlane and they can't because there's three trucks already trying to make the left into the parking lot and they will go past the light they're going to make the left on Maple Tree drive, which has no trucks allowed on it, but it also has trees that will never allow trucks to get through. All we're going to do is increase the traffic on these residential streets where people have no choice, and they need to get around all this new traffic.

Mr. Borger asks the public if they have any other general questions or comments not related to the Woodlane Logistics application.

Ryan B. asks if there is a date for the proposed addendum to the Master Plan?

Mr. Guerrero states – The addendum is available on the Township website for the public to review. It's also been publicly noticed for our November 2, 2022, meeting and it will be formally presented by our Planner to the Land Development Board. If everything goes right, it should be approved that evening and be sent to the Township Committee for their input and vote to make the changes as they deem appropriate.

Brian Morgan asks at the very beginning of the meeting, when you were going through normal opening, you said that this meeting was posted and advertised in January and that can't be possible because this is a special meeting.

Mr. Borger states – You are correct I was just reading my usual script. Jodie was it in the paper?

Ms. Termis states - It was advertised in the in the Burlington County Times and the Times of Trenton.

Bart Parker states Mr. Morgan had mentioned earlier how cars take an alternative route through the neighborhood. I have the same issue here on Forest View Drive. What recourse or what course can I take to get speed bumps put on our road?

Mr. Borger states - The first thing you probably need to do is to contact the police and let them know it's a problem. Then attend the next committee meeting and bring it up there.

Mr. Holshue states - I think that's probably the best way to go.

Mr. Thorpe states – I'm a former township committee person. So that is the right advice is talk to our police Chief and our Township Administrator Wendy Gibson at the township committee.

Ralph Hendrickson states - 37 Mayfaire Circle in Fernbrook. I noticed in one of the aerial shots that just down the road, there was a field of solar panels. I want some foresight from my township committee people as to why we can't plan to put solar panels on the industrial sites i.e., warehouses in the township. We're eating up a lot of valuable land with industrial parks, and we're not making adequate use in terms of gaining solar energy for our communities. It's a real problem in our state. Why can't we be at the forefront and moving ahead in this township? This was one time a very green county. Let's make it green by being smart about how we generate energy in our communities.

Mr. Thorpe states - I urge everybody to read the technical appendix to the master plan that's on the township website. Requiring solar panels on all new warehouses and industrial buildings is a suggestion that we've put in there. So, we've actually asked for that to happen. If we approve it at the next meeting, then it will go to a township committee and then they have the power to enact it or not. Read the technical appendix, share it with friends, talk to people and then once again be at a township meeting and make your voice heard. That is absolutely the best way

Sue Philbrook states – I live on Forceville. I asked about getting speed bumps and I was told by the Administrator that speed bumps are illegal, and you just cannot have them. That's what I was told when I tried to get speed bumps because yes, this is like a through way I did get a speed limit sign and it didn't do a bit of good.

Mr. Roberts states - Speed bumps are illegal, but speed humps are not. A speed hump is large enough that your entire vehicle can kind of go on to move and they are also called speed tables. That would be legal within a roadway right away whereas a speed bump would not.

Mr. Borger asks if there are anymore questions from the public. None

**INFORMAL APPLICATIONS:** None

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None

**COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS, SOLICITOR, ENGINEER, PLANNER, AND SECRATEARY:**  
**OPEN MEETING TO PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**ADJOURN:**

Motion to adjourn Mr. Thrope, Mr. Guerrero second. None opposed.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jodie Termi, Board Secretary