

WESTAMPTON TOWNSHIP LAND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

AUGUST 4, 2021

REGULAR MEETING 7:00 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Call meeting to order.
2. Requirements of the Sunshine Law. This meeting was advertised in the Burlington County Times on January 4, 2021 and posted in the Municipal Building. This meeting is being held virtually via Zoom technology. For Zoom instructions, please go to the Township website: www.westamptonnj.gov, click on Government, then Land Development Board. Instructions to join the meeting are listed under "News and Announcements."
3. Pursuant to NJAC 5:39-1.7(c) any individual wishing to give sworn testimony this evening shall appear by video in addition to audio. Anyone not on video will not be able to testify this evening.
4. Pledge of Allegiance. Welcome to guests.

5. Roll Call:

Mr. Blair, Mr. Borger, Ms. Burkley, Mr. Guerrero, Ms. Haas, Mr. Henley, Mrs. Karp, Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Wisniewski, Mr. Odenheimer, Mr. Ottey, Robert Swartz, Engineer Jim Winckowski, Planner Chris Dochney, and Irene Barry, Secretary

6. Swear in Board Professionals
7. Approval of Meeting Minutes: 7/7/2021 – with clarification regarding Walmart warehouse.
8. Resolutions: for approval/memorialization
 - a. 20-2021 - Westampton Logistics Urban Renewal, LLC, Block 902, Lots 1, 2 & 3 (Western Drive & Hancock Lane) – amended final site plan (parking changes, interior roadway & security revisions) – motion made by Ms. Burkley and seconded by Mr. Blair, abstained by Ms. Karp, Mr. Henley, and Mr. Wisniewski – was memorialized
 - b. 21-2021 - Praukhswami Donuts, LLC, Block 901.01, Lot 4 (Western Drive) – preliminary & final major site plane (new construction) (continuation) – motion was made by Mr. Blair and seconded by Ms. Burkley, abstained by Ms. Karp, Mr. Henley and Mr. Wisniewski – was memorialized
 - c. 22-2021 - MRP Industrial NE, LLC, Block 804, Lot 12 (Irick & Woodlane Road)

– preliminary & final major site plan (construction of two warehouse/distribution facilities 305,040 & 215,280 square feet in size) (continuation) – motion made by Ms. Haas and seconded by Mr. Oddenheimer, abstained by Ms. Karp, Mr. Henley, and Mr. Wisniewski – was memorialized

9. Old Business:

- a. 21-2021 Praukhwami Donuts, LLC, Block 901.01, Lot 4 (Western Drive) – preliminary and final major site plane (new construction) – continued from July 7, 2021

David Shafkowitz attorney on behalf of Praukhwami Donuts, LLC.

Mr. Shafkowitz advised they were asked to look into buffer, landscaping, loading area and storm water with adjoining property owners. Some of the buffering was not proposed on that property. Move employee parking away from the entrance, revised to make four parking spots. Revised their loading area to make in compliance. Proposing an elimination of their sign requests, just proposing one sign on the front. Took time to talk to the owner about the environmental concerns. Owner agreed to supply all reports to the township upon environmental review.

Present with Mr. Shafkowitz are Michael Gallante – Professional Engineer, Jeremy Danley, Alfred Taos and Associates Architects and Yogi Patel, owner of Praukhwami Donuts, LLC. Witnesses were sworn in.

After placing his credentials on the record, Michael Gallante walked the board through the changes that were made to the plans. The changes that are incorporated in the current plan are landscaping/buffering around the perimeter of the property, move employee parking spaces and add a total of four employee parking spaces. Buffer along property boundary with adjoining neighbors regarding storm water management, loading area to be put into compliance with the township, change in signage from pylon to monument type sign and improvement of esthetics. Two other things that Mr. Shafkowitz wanted to bring to the board's attention was that there are non-conforming/non existing issues, one being that the property is slightly less than required. The property dimensions should be one acre and their property are .99 acre and there should be a 200-foot frontage on the property and theirs is only 175 feet. In Mr. Gallante's opinion both are non-existing/nonconforming. The plan will be marked Exhibit B1

Ms. Burkley asked about the stacking of the cars when approaching the window and how would they know at the window who was picking up what. She was advised that once they got to the window, they would tell them what they were there for. Mr. Patel will explain this further when he speaks

Mr. Thorpe asked about the plan with the monument sign – was advised that it would be addressed later in the meeting.

Mr. Shafkowski advised that the fencing would be removed and replaced with landscaping.

Mr. Guerrero asked if the landscaping was okay with everyone.

Mr. Dochney commented on the landscaping – around trash collection at least five feet tall trees, additional shade trees, evergreen trees and shrubs, something more appropriate for full sun, small landscaping around the menu boards and speaker boards open lawn areas landscaping as well. They still need variance for the buffer and at this time they are halfway there for the requirements.

Mr. Thorpe asked about the lighting for the property.

Mr. Gallante advised the improvements would be LED lighting to enhance the overall esthetic character. Eliminate a lot of spillage concerns that were brought up at the previous meeting.

Mr. Winckowski – They are revamping the lighting that is out there now and putting LED 4000K, the light on the bottom of the plan should be eliminated, they just have to make sure they do not over light the property. Mr. Borger voiced concern about the lighting posing a problem to traveling motorist and was advised overall the lighting should not be an issue for traveling motorists.

Mr. Thorpe – the light at the bottom bothers him and wants it to be eliminated.

Mr. Winckowski – Mentioned the sign was still non-conforming but mentioned the way it is drafted it does have a ten-foot set back and wanted to confirm that both side and front are both front property lines regarding the monument sign being replaced

Mr. Dochney confirmed that he believes what he is reading that they are in compliance with the ten-foot set back and no variance is needed.

Mr. Thorpe – was expecting the present sign would go away and the monument sign is taking its place, so he is happy with that change that is being made

Mr. Winckowski – Testimony stated that the sign set back will conform to the regulations required. The floor plan should be consistent with site plan, he has issues that he will take up with the applicant's engineer. Asked about paving and was advised the following by Mr. Shafkowski.

Mr. Shafkowski – advised once the tanks get removed there will be all new paving. Mr. Patel confirmed that there would be all new paving.

Jeremy Danley – Alfred Taos and Associates Architects – Not a licensed architect in New Jersey, therefore Mr. Danley could provide testimony as a fact witness only and not as an expert witness.

Exhibit B3 - Mr. Danley explained that this plan depicts the monument sign that is within the setbacks, will propose a Dunkin sign box illuminated on both sides, adding Westampton Township to the base of the sign 7.5 1/4 and below the 8-foot max for a monument sign. Total area of the sign 39.94 feet, not including the base and the base from grate to the bottom of the sign is going to be three feet high.

Mr. Thorpe – asked about the Dunkin portion of the sign being in Niesha LED's will not go above the 4000K. The other question is the Westampton Township part of the sign looking for a ground light to light up the words Westampton Township.

Mr. Danley – they will conform with whatever they need for the Dunkin light and the ground light.

Exhibit B4 – Mr. Danley stated that the existing building will be converted into the new Dunkin. They are going to clad the existing structure in varying materials. Only the front facing has signage now. They shrunk down the signage to under the forty square feet requirements for the sign issues. Explained what the colors would be on the outside of the building, brown, orange and magenta.

Mr. Patel explained how the bypass lane will work. Everyone is using a Geofencing app, this will allow the employees to know when the car is on location to pick up an online order. Whenever you park your car, the employees will know that you have arrived.

Mr. Shafkowitz asked about the variances that were listed in the July 1, 2021, letter, during the interview they were able to eliminate some of them.

Mr. Dochney advised he would go over the variances which were fifteen and are now down to nine and design waivers were at 5 and are now down to four. He provided a list for review.

Mr. Guerrero asked about fencing again.

Mr. Winckowski advised that all the fencing was being removed.

Mr. Shafkowitz asked if the board would agree to take the fencing down and put landscaping in.

Mr. Dochney conferred that adding more landscaping will be more beneficial for esthetic purposes.

Mr. Blair asked if Mr. Shafkowitz had the time to read the Fire Marshall's report dated July 29th.

Mr. Shafkowitz advised he did not. Mr. Blair advised him that he would see he got a copy of it and went on to read what was on the list as to what was required by code. Advised that his professionals should go over it.

Mr. Thorpe – asked about the overall lighting being over five-foot candles. Mr. Winckowski and Mr. Dochney advised the number is .05 as the maximum lighting requirement, not five-foot. Mr. Swartz asked for clarification about the removal of the fencing and if additional landscaping would be installed and was advised that the fencing would be removed, and the landscaping would replace it. Mr. Borger advised that he did not have any thoughts. Mr. Thorpe also asked about landscaping to the adjoining property. He asked Mr. Dochney to make a comment who stated that there was space to do something, possibly shrubs or flowering bushes, nothing higher than 30-40 inches.

Mr. Thorpe advised that the more greenery in Westampton the better.

Mr. Patel agreed to the landscaping with the adjoining neighbors.

Meeting is now open to the public –

Tim Cook, Owner of Cooks Motors, 2050 Burlington Mount Holly Road, Westampton, NJ - confirmed that he was the adjoining owner to the proposed Dunkin.

He advised the landscaping will affect his view coming down Route 541. He feels it will affect people seeing the cars coming down the road and the landscaping will hurt his business.

Mr. Winckowski advised that a large shrub that is currently there is going to be removed and replaced with a much smaller shrub and spaced throughout the property. He advised what is there now is a solid hedge and the new shrubs will beautify the look of his property.

Mr. Cook advised he had one concern regarding the current owner of the property allowing his waste management to go onto their property to get their waste once every two weeks. Asked if he could continue that relationship. Mr. Patel advised that he talk to the property owner, however he would talk to him regarding his concern. He also asked about the fence coming down and was advised that it would be coming down. He was advised it would be an enhancement for both properties.

Larry Harris, 2 Forrest View Drive, Westampton, NJ. He asked what the exact location was on the map. He was advised by Mr. Borger that it would be adjoining to the Cooks Motors, Mr. Harris indicated he knew where this property was. He also

asked how many cars would fit in the parking lot before they would overflow onto the roadway. Mr. Gallante advised approximately nineteen cars could feasibly fit before going into the roadway. He also asked if the curb was a four-inch-wide Dunkin curbing. He asked if someone could go around the cars if they had to and was advised yes that there was a bypass lane for cars that changed their mind or emergency vehicles.

The hearing was closed to the public at this time.

Mr. Swartz advised the following conditions:

- Add Landscaping/buffering – will agree to work with board planner to have all of this done.
- Monument sign – conform lighting and add ground lighting, interior lighting will be tunable white and no existing lighting over 4000K for the entire project
- Environmental reports to be supplied by the owner as received
- Landscaping between properties, short shrubs, between 24-40 inches in height
- Will include overlay paving to areas where they are not actually doing construction
- Agree to comply with Fire Marshalls reports

A motion was made by Ms. Burkley to approve the application and seconded by Ms. Haas. Mrs. Karp, Mr. Henley, and Mr. Wisniewski abstained.

The application was approved.

A short break was taken from 8:35 PM to 8:40 PM.

10. New Business:

- a. **MRP Industrial NE, LLC, Block 804, Lot 12 (Irlick & Woodlane Road) – preliminary & final major site plan (construction of two warehouse/distribution facilities 305,040 & 215,280 square feet in size) – continued from July 7, 2021**

Michael Floyd attorney with Archer and Greiner appearing on behalf of MRP Industrial NE, LLC. He is seeking a preliminary and final major site plan approval, bulk variance approval and designer waivers. They are seeking a bulk variance to have a height variance of forty-eight feet for height to allow a parapet around the top of the building. He has five witnesses with him this evening.

The following witnesses were all sworn by the Board Solicitor:

Dan Hudson
Christian Roche
Dan Disario

Scott Daniel
Craig Woodruff

Mr. Floyd listed the following exhibits:

- A1 - Aerial Photograph of area in question
- A2 – Rendering of Site Plan
- A3a – Conceptual floor plan and elevations of Building #1
- A3b - Conceptual floor plan and elevations of Building #2
- A4a - Building perspective from ground level photo
- A4b - Building perspective from aerial level photo
- A5a - Photograph of one hundred Western Drive (to show what building will look like)
- A5b - Photograph of one hundred Western Drive (to show what building will look like from corner angle)

Dan Hudson – Managing Principal for MRP Industrial – described the property between the NJ Turnpike and Route 295 and the property is industrially zoned. It is attractive because the lay out allows for two smaller buildings.

Mr. Hudson stated that they are building without tenants signed up, with the two-building configuration they could possibly have three to five tenants. Mr. Floyd asked Mr. Hudson if the number of parking spaces, loading docks and other site improvements are typical of industrial buildings when trying to build a Class A product and was advised by Mr. Hudson that they were very consistent.

Mr. Winckowski asked about his comment regarding the property being in between Route 295 and the New Jersey Turnpike. Mr. Hudson stated that as an industrial real estate perspective, location is what drives attractiveness, easy access to the main thoroughfares. Mr. Winckowski further asked about the main access plan is to use Woodlane Road from Route 541 primarily and asked if that would be suitable for that use and was advised that it would be.

Mr. Borger asked why he would think Woodlane Road was appropriate as opposed to Route 541 onto Route 295.

Mr. Hudson advised that the traffic flows much better with the approach from Woodlane Road.

Christian Roche – Langan Engineering – after placing his credentials on the record, he will be referencing two exhibits, A1 and A2.

Exhibit A1 is a site arial and was prepared by Langan Engineering and described the property in question. The project site is described as Block 804, Lot 12, it is approximately forty-three acres. The site is primarily occupied by farmland currently. Access is primarily off of Irick Road. The entire property is located in the Industrial zone.

Exhibit A2 is a color rendering plan and was prepared by Langan Engineering. They are proposing to construct two warehouses totaling 520,320 square feet, warehouse building one, which will be on the Northern side of the property and will have 305,040 square feet, forty-nine loading docks, ninety-six trailer stalls and approximately 318 car parking stalls. Warehouse building two, which will be on the Southern side of the building and will have 215,280 feet, forty-two loading docks as well as 286 car parking stalls. They are proposing the truck port areas to be placed away from BCIT and other county uses. They are also proposing both buildings to be forty-five feet tall to the roofline and they are asking for a variance for a three-foot parapet, which will raise the building height to forty-eight feet, however if the board has an issue, they will keep the conforming height of forty-five feet.

They are proposing two access points, one on Woodlane Road and one on Irick Road. The access point on Woodlane Road will be rights in only and will allow both rights and lefts out of the property. The access point from Irick Road will also be rights in only and will also allow rights and lefts out of the property. Installing all new concrete curb along their site frontage, a six-foot wide sidewalk and slightly widening Irick Road into their property.

Mr. Roche indicated the project meets the township code for parking and loading requirements. The Township requires one parking stall for every 5,000 square feet of warehouse use and one parking stall for every 250 square feet of office space. They are proposing 604 parking spaces, which meets the requirements. They are also proposing 16 ADA parking spaces. They are proposing ninety-one loading stalls. The trailer parking stalls will be ninety-six and the ordinance reads that no trailer can be parked for a more than fifteen days and no trailers will be parked on location for more than fifteen days.

Trash operations are dictated by the named tenant. They are currently showing four dumpster locations, two for each building but again will be determined by a tenant. Trash will be provided by a private provider with trash being picked up a few times a week.

Storm water management design complies fully with the state and township regulations, and they are significantly exceeding what is required.

Electric and Gas will be provided by PSE&G. NJ American water will provide the water services. A water tank will be provided on site, the tank will be screened by landscaping. Final will be sewer and will be provided by Mount Holly MUA.

Landscaping proposing over six hundred new trees and over seven hundred new shrubs along Irick Road and Woodlane Road and between BCIT. As for lighting they are proposing all new LED lighting fixtures around the perimeter with a mounting height of twenty-five feet. In addition, there will be forty-nine pole fixtures and seventeen building

mounted fixtures also mounted at 25 feet in height. All will have three thousand kelvin they have no problem to implementing any type of shielding devices.

They are showing two conceptual monument signage for Irick Road entry and Woodlane Road entry. Once they determine a tenant, if they would seek a different sign, they would come back to the board for any approvals that would be needed.

According to 250-22B2 they will have proposing buffer strips between residential and non-residential areas, a guard rail adjacent to Irick Road, small retaining area on the Eastern portion of the property and driveways that will go through the buffering areas as well. The planner will provide further details when he gives his testimony.

According to 250-33B3 – trash enclosures to have screenings, they are proposing no screening due to the fact that there will be dumpsters and they will be providing landscaping around the dumpsters.

The planners comment regarding a waiver for parking stalls, they have no objection to adding in a few more non-employee parking stalls if need be. They will do this in coordination with the planner and the engineer.

According to 250-22R6 – no loading area in front yard – they are proposing to have the loading area in the front yard because it is a better design to put it on Irick Road so that truck operations are away from BCIT and other County uses.

250-22G – from a lighting perspective they are seeking a waiver to change the candles from 0.5 maximum average to two 3.5-foot candles and on the sidewalk 0.5-to-1.4-foot candles for safety purposes. They have been granted this waiver on other projects in Westampton Township.

Also, a potential waiver for 250-25J1 asking for waiver for signage because they do not know who the tenant will be.

196-8C1 – waiver to install adjacent landscaping islands to the sidewalk area to meet that requirement.

Potential waiver 196-8b4 states if parking is located in the front yard, they are proposing significant buffering at this time, but no berm at this time.

Mr. Floyd asked Mr. Roche if he had the opportunity to review the Engineer's letter dated July 30th and the Planner's letter dated July 29th. Mr. Roche indicated that he did have the opportunity to review them, and he would be able to address all of the comments.

Mr. Borger asked Mr. Roche to go back to the lighting, the ordinance requires 0.5-foot candles, asked what the site will have. Mr. Roche indicated in paved areas they will have 2-to-3.5-foot candles and in sidewalk areas they will have 0.8-foot candles.

Mr. Henley asked if the bays are in the back of the building and two access points, one on Woodlane Road and the truck access is in the back of the building which could leave them to want to come down the small street and go over the bridge. What will lead that not to happen. What will be done when they have larger vehicles trying to make that turn. Mr. Roche asked for clarification. Mr. Henley advised when you make a right out of the parking lot onto Irick Road and then go and attempt to make a turn onto Irick Road at the overpass. Mr. Roche indicated that the comment was made by Mr. Hudson earlier that they anticipate that trucks arriving to the site will be using Woodlane Road and then would be using Irick Road when they exit. Mr. Henley's concern is that cars will have an issue on that area of the roadway along with the trucks.

Mr. Wisniewski asked what the new expanded width of the buffering area on Irick Road on the South side closest to the infiltration basin, what is the width from the new expanded Irick Road to the pavement. Mr. Roche indicated at its minimum is twenty-five feet.

Mr. Borger advised that Mr. DiSario had the qualifications to proceed in tonight's meeting as an expert.

Dan DiSario – Langan Engineering – After placing his credentials on the record, he described the traffic and impact study. As part of the site plan application, they prepared a Traffic Impact Study on June 11, 2021, that relates to the traffic aspects of this application. The access that will be provided to this proposed project will have two driveways, one along Woodlane and one along Irick Road, both of which will not allow left turn access into either of these driveways. The County requested that no left turns be allowed into the site of either of the driveways. They did a comprehensive traffic study and at a high level of that study they did a comprehensive count program. They took into consideration the pandemic for 2021, the counts were lower, and they adjusted all the 2021 counts upwards to reflect more appropriate levels to account for the influence of the pandemic. Specifically, they identified that peak hours during the morning occurred from 7:30 to 8:30 in terms of the highest traffic volumes near the site and during an afternoon period they identified the peak hours from 3:00 to 4:00 PM and on Saturday the peak hour was identified from 1:00 to 2:00. The traffic study was done from 6-9, 11-2 and 3-7 during weekdays and from 11-2 on Saturdays. They created a future base volume by taking the existing 2021 counts and adjusting them upwards by 1 1/2 percent to account for background growth due to overall development. They also accounted for specific projects in and around the area of Burlington Township, the Dunkin Donuts application at Route 541 and the warehouse that we were involved in on Western Drive as well as a housing development on Bromley Boulevard in Burlington Township. They accounted for all of that background growth for future projects for 2022.

They identified how much traffic this project would generate. They indicated it would be based on types of warehouses and types of tenants. Typically, in this area are representative High Q warehouses that do not need a lot of people to run those types of warehouses. At the request of the County, they modeled more traditional types of

warehouses, specifically by looking at Warehouse Trip Generation Rates. These rates estimate this warehouse during a morning peak hour would have seventy-five vehicles coming in and forty vehicles exiting for a total of a total two-way volume of 115 vehicles. During a weekday evening peak hour would have thirty vehicles coming in and ninety-five vehicles exiting for a total two-way volume of 125 vehicles. For a Saturday midday peak hour, they would have twenty vehicles coming in and ten vehicles exiting for a total two-way volume of thirty vehicles.

By the clients request by not having vehicles make a left turn into the site limits the opportunities for vehicles to turn into this site. They would overall anticipate about 25 % of the cars will be to and from the East along Woodlane Road, about 50% would be to and from Irick Road to the South, to the right of the drawing, about 20% would be to and from the North along Irick Road and about 5% would be along Woodlane Road on the Westside of the Turnpike to and from the South. All trucks would have to come in and make a right turn off of Woodlane Road into the Woodlane access point or they could come down Woodlane Road and make a right onto Irick Road and make a right into the driveway from Irick Road. They would envision most if not all of the trucks would be originating from the Turnpike or Route 295. When leaving they would turn right onto Irick and then proceed over the turnpike and then make a right turn onto Irick and proceed up to the Route 541 corridor. Irick Road in between Woodlane Road and Rancocas Road has an existing ordinance prohibits no trucks can use that portion of Irick Road. Car traffic can use any of the roadways as they are not restricted as to what roads they can use to and from the site. If you look at vehicles that are associated with this development, at a worse case there would be an increase of one new vehicle every one to two minutes during peak hours. In any direction on any of these mentioned roadways that level of traffic increase will not amount to a noticeable difference in traffic on the surrounding roads.

The traffic that they have estimated in the traffic study will be part of the record and the county consistent with numerous other warehouses in Burlington County, the applicant will be required to conduct traffic counts at the site to identify how much traffic is at those sites. If there is a significant departure from the estimated volumes in the approved traffic study, the county reserves the right and act upon their rights to address those impact. As specific tenants are identified for these sites, they will have to go over their plans with the County with the specific tenants regarding when employees will be coming and going as well as truck volume. The county will continue to have leverage over this project at this time as far as the traffic goes.

Mr. DiSario touched on Mr. Henley's comment regarding trucks traveling over the turnpike overpass. Irick Road as well as Woodlane Road are both County roadways. Burlington County accommodates truck traffic along their roadways unless there is a specific prohibition otherwise. The bridge coming over the roadway is roughly twenty-eight feet, approximately curb to curb and is striped with small shoulder, enough to accommodate room for two vehicles to pass in opposite directions. He advised that there is a large radius that would be able to accommodate larger vehicles like the trucks from this warehouse development.

Mr. Wisniewski asked about the traffic study, was it done with vehicle road strips. He was advised they were done by video. At the locations that they were done by video, were they done at some of the entrance's ways to the BCIT School or the 295 overpass. If video were not done there, it would not show the traffic backing up at start and stop times for school. When the traffic study was done was school in session or was it fully functioning or hybrid. Video counts were conducted at off the intersection of Woodlane Road and Irick Road. They captured everything in that intersection. One section was covered, and one was not. He also asked if school was in session but was told he did not know if it was hybrid or not. Mr. Wisniewski also asked if the Emergency Services or the Police Department were consulted on the area or the volume of calls when responding to calls. He advised that he have to check with Mr. Roche about site plan. Mr. Wisniewski also asked what the percentage of the traffic counts would be increased. Mr. DiSario advised that comparing counts that they did for the Western Drive project from 2021 to pre pandemic, 2019, there was an increase of 40% during the morning weekday peak hour, 40% during the evening weekday peak hour and 30% during the Saturday midday peak hour.

Mr. Wisniewski asked that the average vehicle count that was done was basically a national standard, earlier it was said that this was a prime location due to the NJ Turnpike and 295. He thinks that using a standard is wider open because this area is semi unique. Is there any factor because of the proximity of the location? Mr. DiSario indicated that in that publication there are different types of warehouses that yield different estimates for traffic generation. What we did for the warehouse category is we used rates that were based on more traditional warehouse that rely on more labor-intensive operations. He advised that in terms of the data base for more modern warehouses which are known as high Q warehouses as opposed to traditional warehouse, in the last ten to twenty years most of the warehouses you see off 295 and the Turnpike corridor have been high Q warehouse operations, so they require less people to run them. Those trip rates came from studies that were done, some from Langan, in higher rate areas up North, which were lower, however they used higher rates to be conservative. Modern warehouses that you see up and down the highways, those rates are lower than this project.

Mr. Wisniewski asked about what he stated about the generous ratio for the turn at the overpass. He indicated he disagrees with him regarding that comment. If at some point, there is an issue is there a plan in place or have they talked to the turnpike authority to see if there is anything they can do.

Mr. DiSario advised he did not talk to the turnpike authority and that he believes the bridge is the county's bridge. The county has made no indication of any structural integrity of that bridge. He is not aware of any issues with respect to that bridge.

Mr. Winckowski asked about his traffic report, wanted to know if the county gave him any indication about a traffic signal, but there is no intention for this applicant to build this signal. Mr. DiSario advised that that was correct. Mr. Winckowski asked if the

county gave him any intention if or when they would build a signal in that intersection, and he advised they did not, but they are not through the county review process. Going through the traffic study, in the no build, without a signal in the AM and the PM you are saying that there is about 220 seconds in the AM and 70 seconds in the PM and with a proposed build you are saying 250-260 seconds in the AM and 80 seconds in the PM. Mr. DiSario advised that was correct. Mr. Winckowski asked about the 95% queuing involved in the 250 seconds in the AM and Mr. DiSario advised 19-20 vehicles with no build and with a build twenty-two vehicles, which is approximately a 2-3 vehicle increase. In the existing condition the cars back up about four hundred feet from that turning movement and with the build 500-550. Right now, it is about 475 to 500 and with the build it will go to 550. Mr. Winckowski asked what the driveway separate distance between the driveway and the intersection. From the intersection it is about 550-600 feet.

Mr. Winckowski asked if he knew what the turning radius was, and Mr. DiSario gave an approximate number of forty-five feet.

Mr. Winckowski asked if when the counts were done, did they pick up the number of trucks that were currently using the roadways in question. Mr. DiSario indicated he would have to get that number for him. Mr. Winckowski advised his concern was to know if there are trucks currently making that turn

Mr. Floyd explained that he certainly wanted to answer any questions of the professionals but wanted to make everyone aware that they are currently working with the county planning board, and they do not have their site plan approval yet from the county. They will keep the board up to date with any approvals that the county may give them.

Ms. Burkley mentioned that they did not do the study from 2 to 3 when the big schools let out with all the big buses.

She feels that a stop light is needed. She suggested that only left turns out of the driveways, no right turns out of the driveways.

Ms. Burkley spoke about her perceived dangers of the Turnpike bridge and the turns in the road. She indicated as vehicles come up Woodlane road to approach the bridge, there is a dangerous curve and rise in the road that makes it hard to see what is in the intersection ahead and very dangerous.

Mr. DiSario stated that the turn after the bridge has a 45 foot turn radius.

Ms. Burkley advised that her research says that for semi trucks a 55 foot turn radius is required and stated that turning left onto Woodlane Road has an even smaller turn radius. Trucks will need to enter both lanes to turn, if a turn is even possible.

Mr. Burkley also advised that the road on all sides of the bridge is on an embankment. There is no flat ground for a truck to go if the road is not big enough to handle the turns. Going over the lines of the road just a little could cause the truck to go down the steep sides and cause a major accident.

Mr. DiSario clarified that the traffic counts were conducted from 6-9 in the Am, 11-2 in the PM and 3-7 in the evening.

Mr. Guerrero asked if the bridge were out what would they do. Mr. DiSario indicated that they would have to go out of the site by making a left turn via Woodlane Road to the Route 541 corridor. Mr. Guerrero asked that right now there would be no curbing and Mr. DiSario advised that that was correct.

Mr. Floyd advised that he confer with the applicant.

Mr. Guerrero also asked that trucks coming off the turnpike will probably be routed by GPS up Irick Road and make a left over the bridge and then find that both entrances are not available to make a left-hand turn. Mr. DiSario stated that they would go up to Route 541 and make a U-turn.

Mr. Odenheimer asked if they did a signal warrant and if the signal was warranted and if it was done why was it not proposed. Mr. DiSario stated that they did do a warrant, it is warranted based on current volumes regardless of whether this development happens or not. Mr. Odenheimer asked why it was not proposed. Mr. DiSario advised that Mr. Floyd indicated that it was the county's road and if they warrant it is needed, they will have to take that into consideration. Mr. Odenheimer asked whether turning lanes or right turn lanes were warranted in the analysis. Based on the analysis it states that the left turn would not need to have a left turn lane.

Mr. Borger asked about truckers coming to this location using the GPS, I assume that they would not know that the only egress is right turn only. Mr. DiSario advised that from his limited knowledge he knows that the technology is getting very sophisticated, and he would venture to guess that the routing software would reroute them. It is called GEO Fencing and he knows that GEO Fencing in other measures are everyday evolving into all of the software that the public uses.

Mr. Haas asked if they do consider adjacent developments, specifically Fountain Square which is on Irick Road and Route 541 for large retail where they were going to move the traffic light from Irick to Western Drive. She asked if they took that into consideration and was advised the did not because that project had some fatal flaws. He was not aware which side the fatal flaws were on, Westampton or Burlington Township.

Mr. Wisniewski asked about emergency personnel getting around the traffic and this would be detrimental, and he thinks that the county should be involved with these discussions along with the emergency personnel.

Mr. Henley asked if they could look at some of the areas that the members are bringing up to Mr. Floyd and his professionals.

Mr. DiSario advised that he hears the concerns and are all justified and will bring those concerns to the county.

Mr. Daniel approved to speak on behalf of the applicant and placed his credentials on the record.

Scott Daniel – Architect for Ware Malcomb - spoke about the building type. They are proposing 520,000 square feet of class A warehouse space, single loaded, rear loaded space. Office on the front of the building. True Light Industrial Flex space.

Exhibit A3 shows building one, 305,040 SF, class A warehouse space, forty-nine dock doors, looking at two offices on the corners with two future offices and the rest would be warehouse use. The proposed building would be a prefabricated concrete panel on the envelope with steel columns and open web joists. The maximum roof height is forty-four'5". Building one is the North is the exterior elevation broken up in two larger facades, concrete prefabricated painted panel. South side is where the loading docks are. They are lower in height and to break up the elevation they will use color and elevation. The East and West elevation shows the esthetic quality of using different heights, different colors within the elevation. Building two are essentially the same as building number one. The maximum height of building number two is forty-three'4" which is pursuant to the ordinance definition.

Exhibit A3B building two with a height maximum roof deck of forty-three'4", 215,280 SF.

Exhibit A4A shows a ground level photograph of two warehouses

Exhibit A4B shows an aerial view of the warehouses

Exhibit A5A shows the loading dock area of one hundred Western Drive

Exhibit A5B shows the entry corner photograph of one hundred Western Drive

Mr. Burkley asked to look at the picture showing the school and asked if there would be a fence separating the two properties. Mr. Roche advised he has no objection to having a fence erected and they would work with the boards professionals to have something put between those properties.

Mr. Guerrero asked if they had any aerial perspectives from the West. Get Mr. Floyds advised that he did not. Mr. Guerrero wanted to know what it would look like with the trucks in the loading docks.

Mr. Floyd advised that they may need to recall some of their witnesses who have already testified and then his final witness who has not yet testified. If they have any updates from the county they will share them at the September 1, 2021, meeting.

Due to the late hour, this application will be continued to September 1, 2021, due to the time. The applicant does not have to re-notice anyone for this meeting.

Mr. Blair asked if the applicants professionals meet with the Fire Marshall's office prior to the next meeting. Mr. Floyd advised he would look into setting up those meetings right away.

b. New Jersey American Water Company, Inc., Block 1203, Lots 17 & 18/Woodlane Road, Woodlane Station Replacement Application for "d2" Variance Approval, Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval, and Planning/Bulk Variance Approval – (continued to September 1, 2021) – no new notice will be required.

11. Informal Applications: None

12. Correspondence: None

13. Open meeting for public comment: No comments

14. Comments from Board members, Solicitor, Engineer, Planner and Secretary: None other than everyone welcoming Mrs. Karp to the board.

15. Adjourn – motion made by Mr. Wisniewski and seconded by Mr. Guerrero

Respectfully Submitted:

Rene Barry, Secretary
Westampton Township Land Development Board