

WESTAMPTON TOWNSHIP LAND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

September 7, 2022

MINUTES

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Westampton Township Land Development Board was held via the Zoom platform virtually on September 7, 2022 at 7:00 P.M. The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman David Guerrero and the opening statement required by Sunshine Law was read. This meeting was advertised in the Burlington County Times on January 10, 2022 and on the Township website. All guests were welcomed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Grace, Mr. Guerrero, Mr. Henley, Mr. Holshue, Mr. Jones, Mr. Odenheimer, Mr. Thorpe
Absent: Mr. Borger, Mr. Carr, Mr. Fagan,
Professional Staff: Attorney Nick Sullivan, Engineer Michael Roberts, Planner Chris Dochney, Secretary Jodie Termini

SWEAR IN NEW BOARD MEMBER:

Cherelle Tolor, Alternate II

SWEAR IN PROFESSIONALS:

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

MINUTES:

August 3 - Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Odenheimer second. None opposed. Ms. Tolor abstains.

RESOLUTION(S):

18-22 – Continuation of Rancocas Holdings, LLC, Block:201 Lot: 10 & 11, Truck Parking Storage Facility application to September 7th, 2022. Motion to approve Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Holshue second. None opposed. Mr. Henley and Ms. Tolor abstains.

19-22 – BBL NJ Land, LLC. Block: 906.07 Lot: 8.01. Extension of Resolution 17-2019. Motion to approve Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Jones second. None opposed. None abstains.

20-22 – Continuation of 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). Motion to approve Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Odenheimer second. None opposed. Mr. Henley and Ms. Tolor abstains.

OLD BUSINESS:

Rancocas Holdings – B:201 L:10 & 11, Use Variance to permit parking/storage of vehicles. Continued to October 5, 2022. None opposed. None abstain.

NEW BUISNESS:

Crown Point Associates, LLC – Block: 807 Lot:1 – Extension of Resolution 21-2019. Motion to approve Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Grace second. None opposed. None abstain.

Fly High Express – B:401 L:3 Variance to permit a truck repair shop continue until October 5, 2022. Motion to approve Mr. Jones, Mr. Odenheimer second. None opposed. Mr. Henley abstains.

Sign Pros – B:403 L:1, Variance for a new sign for Inductotherm.
Mr. Sullivan swore in Rowan Watson, Attorney for the applicant and Nick Kappato.

Ms. Watson states - We're applying for a variance for a new sign on the side of our building. We are requesting a variance because the ordinance requires the maximum height of the sign is 3' but a portion of our sign would actually be 6' and that is due to the logo that has been in use for almost 50 years for Inductotherm, you may have all seen it but it's a big "I" with a circle dot. For the positive criteria, essentially the logo really can't be changed in terms of the design and the way we say the word Inductotherm with the big "I" on the left. The nice thing is this will be on the front of the building to help identify the building to the community. We feel that's a positive thing for the community. Another thing to consider is that the building is a large building and is setback far from the road. So, it won't appear massive, even though just the one portion is higher than that 3' requirement in the ordinance and there is no negative criteria that I can see. The light will not blink or flash. The proposed photo renderings show that there are options that our marketing team has put together but this this is the final design we are looking to get approved.

Mr. Kappato states - These are called reverse channel letters, which means there is internal illumination, but it's a halo effect. So the letters will light up and you will have a halo effect that will illuminate it and it is the exact same letters that we have on the monument sign that's out on the road at the entrance but this would be on the center of the building and will be a lit sign.

Mr. Guerrero asks – Do you know what the lumen output is of these LEDs?

Mr. Kappato states – These are standard white LEDs, but you're not going to see them because it has a halo effect so you're not going to have direct lighting. I'm sorry, I cannot testify to the exact lumen output. But I know the ordinance doesn't allow for the light to radiate past the property or anything like that. This will be a very soft lighting. This will be no different than the lighting that is on the monument sign.

Mr. Thorpe states - One of the things that was said was that they are standard white LEDs there's actually no such thing. LED, particularly on White comes in all different color values and color temperatures. Do you happen to know what the color temperature of these LEDs are?

Mr. Kappato states - I don't but if the Board were to have a recommendation for the lumens and the and the LED, I don't I think we'd have no problem matching those recommendations.

Mr. Thorpe states -On over lighting we suggest staying under 4000 Kelvin and I want to applaud you for the halo effect it is probably the nicest design that I believe exists out there for this type of signs. In my personal opinion 4000 or less is really quite appropriate. You know, we want it to work on your building and finding the right color temperature on the building is what truly matters. Looking at your photos 4000 max is what I would do. I would suggest doing a test for yourselves. You may find out that 3200 provides a gorgeous glow. It's a warmer color. I'm a big fan of warm white and I'm not a big fan of harsh white lighting. I do think that on your building somewhere in that range would be really quite appropriate. I would ask for a test and then make your decision but if it was within that range, that's my comfort zone.

Mr. Kappato states - I have no objections with the 4000 or less. Inductotherm does have their own art department and I'd be happy to work with them. We try to use a product that is going to last for a long time and not fade over a period of time.

Mr. Dochney states – Building signage is permitted at a maximum of 3’ in height and 20’ in length and they are proposing 6’ high and 16’ wide. I think it'd be very beneficial if one of the applicants could share their screen of an image of the sign because we were provided with photo renderings of what sign will look like on the building since this is being recorded and I think it's a good idea.

Ms. Termi – Shared the screen to show 4 photos of the Inductotherm sign.

Mr. Guerrero asks – Are there any more comments from the board members? There were none.

Mr. Guerrero asks – Are there any comments from the public? There were none.

Mr. Guerrero asks Mr. Sullivan – Can you give us details regarding this application.

Mr. Sullivan states - The applicant Inductotherm is seeking to install a proposed sign on one of its buildings that will be 6’ in height on one portion of the design the rest of the design being smaller than 6’ high and 16’ wide on the premises located at 10 Indel Avenue, Westampton Township block 403 lot 1 on the tax map of the Township of Westampton. This property is in the Industrial Zone. This is an application for a signage variance and the applicant would require a bulk variance to permit a façade side over 3’ in height. Pursuant to the ordinances the maximum signage height is facade sign shall be 3’. The aggregate is proposing a sign with 6’ in a certain portion which has been described tonight. The Board can grant both variance relief for the applicant proves positive and negative criteria. The applicant can satisfy the positive criteria by showing the application advances one or more purposes of the municipal land use law such as promotion of the general welfare or by showing that applying the townships ordinances to the applicant will result in unique undue hardship. The applicant must also show the negative criteria and that the application can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good or substantially impairing the master plan or ordinances. A majority vote is required to approve when making your vote please identify any conditions for approval prior to voting.

Mr. Guerreo asks is there a motion to approve as discussed with the 4000 or less on the lighting. Motion to approve Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Holshue second. None opposed. None abstain.

Mr. Kappato asks – We would like to request a waiver to proceed at our own risk instead of waiting for the Resolution to be signed.

Mr. Holshue states – I just want to note that you won't have a problem with that because by the time we get the documents into us and they are processed then you're probably talking three to four weeks because of the way things are going in the office right now. I don't see it as a big risk.

INFORMAL APPLICATIONS: None

CORRESPONDENCE: None

OPEN MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT: None

COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS, SOLICITOR, ENGINEER, PLANNER AND SECRETARY:

Mr. Thorpe states – I want to Congratulate and welcome Ms. Tolor to the Board. Mr. Jones and Mr. Henley also congratulate Ms. Tolor.

Mr. Roberts states – I investigated the well question from last month’s correspondence. It looks like a couple of the R2, R3, and R6 zones apparently have a requirement for public water and sewer for lots 20,000 square feet or less. There are a couple of slight restrictions in terms of whether a property can use potable water. But it looks like it's only restricted to residential zones. I just wanted the board to be aware of that and I can prepare a quick response letter for that correspondence if the board desires to respond back. The rest of the questions aren’t applicable because of the mixed use and across the street keeps getting pushed back but there is water on the opposite side of the property anyway. That shouldn’t affect ground water in any way shape or form for the lot in question. There's no plan within the 25-year horizon and everything in the area is a C1 and B1 zone and because of that I don't foresee groundwater use increasing or decreasing. Mostly everybody in that area will be using a public water system. I can respond back to that piece of correspondence, but I just wanted the Board to know.

Mr. Guerrero asks Mr. Dochney – Where do we stand with the Master Plan Review?

Mr. Dochney states – I’m working on it right now and will be resuming when this meeting is done. I'm hoping to have the draft done Friday but if not early next week and send it out to the Board.

Mr. Guerrero asks the Board if they have any other comments - None

MEETING ADJOUNED:

Motion to adjourn Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Odenheimer second. None opposed.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jodie Termi, Board Secretary